

A
VINDICATION
 OF THE
Doctrine of Baptism,
 As Held by the PEOPLE call'd
QUAKERS;
 In ANSWER to
Philip Bedingfield's Pamphlets,
 Especially that, Called,
A Letter to a Quaker in Norfolk:

WHEREIN,

His Arguments for *Water-Baptism* are *Enervated:*
 His Mistaken Notions concerning the *Baptism*
 of the *Spirit*, *Detected:* And his Exposition of
 sundry Texts of *Scripture*, *Refuted:*

PROVING,

that the Baptism with the Holy Spirit, is the True
Baptism of Christ; whereby every True Believer is
initiated into the Christian Church.

WITH

A QUESTIONARY POSTSCRIPT
 Directed to the CLERGY.

By JOSIAH FORSTER.

LONDON: Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowles
 at the Bible in George-Yard, Lombard-street, 1732.

A
 VINDICATION
 OF THE
 Doctrine of Baptism

As Held in the People's Court

UAKER 2;

10 IN M M 67 W E R

Philip Bedford's Pamphlets

178-1

A Ticket to a Quinlan in Norfolk:



THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1 finished into the Christian Church.

WITH
A QUESTIONARY POSTSCRIPT
Directed to the CLERGY.

By Joseph H. Foster, Jr.

ON D N: Printed and sold by the printer of the

T. H. E.

PUBLISHER

TO THE

READER.

THE following Sheets having been penn'd before the Writer had heard of the Death of P. Bedingsfield, Author of the Letter, &c. to which they are a Reply, is the Occasion, why sundry Passages therein, are address'd to him in the same Style and

A 2 manner

Manner of Expression, as if he were yet living.

It is thought proper, notwithstanding his Decease, to publish this Answer, since 'twas written not for his Sake only, but principally for the Use of those who have been, or may be, his Readers: Nor does the Author hereof suppose, that he is now fighting without an Adversary, seeing he hath been credibly inform'd, that some of the Clergy had an hand in that Performance.

If any such shall think fit to employ their Pens in the Cause here oppugned.

To the Reader.

iv

opposed, let them do it with that
Seriousness and Candour which be-
comes Religious Controversists;
and forbear the Use of those mean
Arts, low Evasions, and pitiful
Perversions of Men's Words, which
no Writers have been more expert in
than the Quakers * Adversaries;
a Practice, however, much to their
own Disadvantage, with thinking
Men, who always esteem such Me-
thods to be below the Dignity of a
Cause

* Witness Keish, Lesley, and many others: And e-
specially, the Author of a late Vindication of the Bishop
of Lichfield and Coventry, some Part of whose Abilities
that way is justly expos'd in an Appendix to a Defence of
Quakerism, lately publish'd, in Answer to Patrick Smith

*Cause that has Truth and Reason
to support it.*

*They therefore recommend unto
all Men, the Observation of the
Apostle's Advice, 1 Thess. v. 21.
Prove all Things, hold fast that
which is good ; and especially, a
diligent Searching of the Holy
Scriptures, by the Testimony of
which every Branch of the Doctrine
they profess, is most effectually con-
firmed.*

*Reader, If any Thing herein
written shall contribute to thy form-
ing a right Judgment in the present
Controversy*

To the Reader. vii

Controversy, the Author has the End he aims at, which he professes to be nothing else, but the Advancement of Truth, according to the best of his Understanding.

Farewel.

T H E

Contrary to the Author's
 End he aims at, which he professes
 to be nothing else, but the Advance-
 ment of Truth, according to the best
 of his Understanding.

Farewell.

THE
Quaker's Answer
TO THE
Norfolk Letter, &c.

THE Author's *Introduction*, as far as the ninth Page, I shall wholly pass by, as accounting it foreign to the Question, saving that I freely grant what he delivers pag. 8. and 9. as maintaining, that Water-Baptism was a *Jewish Ceremony* practised by them under the *Legal Dispensation*. *Ainsworth* on *Gen. xvii. 12.* *Dr. Hammond* on *Mat. iii. 1.* His *Practical Catechism*, lib. vi. Sect. 2. *Williams* Arch-bishop of Canterbury, in his Book called *The Principles of Religion* explain'd, pag. 149. *Eobard* in his *Ecclesiastical History*, pag. 20. *Diodate* on *Mat. iii. 1.* *Pool's Synops. Crit.* on *Mat. iii. 6.* hold the same.

Near the Close of pag. the ninth, our *Norfolk* Author mentions the Passage of our Saviour's being baptized by *John the Baptist*,
B Mat.

The Quaker's Answer to the

Mat. iii. 15. From whence he would infer, that Christ's submitting thereto, was to be an Example for all Christians to imitate. But the Answer which our Friend *Thomas Johnson* gave Dr. *Taswell*, Rector of *Newington*, concerning the same Text, seems to be a very suitable Return to this Author; his Words are, "As to Christ's being baptized of *John*, which the Dr. seems to hang upon, it has not the least Shadow of an Argument for the perpetuating of it, (i. e. Water-Baptism) as an Ordinance in the Church of Christ, but quite the contrary; for when *John* forbid him, saying, *I have need to be baptized of thee*, Jesus answering, said unto him, *Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all Righteousness*. Which is a manifest Argument of its short Duration, in that Jesus answered the Righteousness of the *Legal Ceremony* in his own Person, and so fulfilled and ended it, as to any farther Righteousness or Obligation, as he did *Circumcision*, the *Purification-Offering*, *Passover*, and finally all *Legal Offerings*, by that one Offering of himself upon the Cross. Will the Doctor have these Things fulfilled? Or by this Example to be continued as obligatory on all his Followers to do as he did, which would be to deny Christ come in the *Flesh* with a witness."

Besides

NORFOLK LETTER, &c.

Besides, 'tis evident, that this *Norfolk* Author holds that *John's* Baptism is abolished. How inconsistent is it then, for him to pretend to enforce the Continuance of Water-Baptism, from Christ's submitting to what himself clearly maintains to have been long ago abolished? Nor is there the least Reason imaginable, to suppose that Water-Baptism is any more derivative on us from Christ's complying with *John's* Baptism, than Circumcision is from his being circumcised, since both are abolished.

Had this Author had the Foresight and Policy of some others who have attacked the *Quakers* on this Subject, as to have denied that Water-Baptism was ever known in the World before the Days of *John the Baptist*; and asserted, that it was commanded *John* under the Gospel Dispensation, and administered by him as a Gospel Ordinance: That it was the same Baptism which *John* practised, that Christ commanded, *Mat. xxviii.* and which the Apostles used after Christ's Ascension; he might, at least, have had more Room for Argument. But he, representing Water-Baptism to have been an old *Jewish Rite* or Ceremony, at once bespeaks the Unsuitableness thereof with the Gospel, or Spiritual Dispensation, which exhibiting the Substance, puts an End to all such Ceremonies and Shadows.

The Quaker's Answer to the

And his asserting the Abolition of *John's* Baptism, places such an obstructing Block in his Way, as wholly deprives him of every the least Dependence thereon, as a Basis to erect his Fabrick upon. He must therefore of Necessity dig for a new Foundation, or else his Superstructure will easily devolve: For if the Baptism of *John* be abolished, as he affirms, there's nothing left him to ground the least Pretence of Argument on, without a positive Precept of Christ; so my principal Business will be to examine what he has delivered to prove such a Precept or Command.

And in the first Place, I shall present the Reader with what the Author maintains concerning the Baptism of *John* its being abolished.

Pag. 26. " Let it be noted (says he) that
" there were three Water-Baptisms in the
" World at one Time, the *Jewish*, *St. John's*,
" and our *Saviour's*: The two first are ABOLISHED, but the latter remains, and will
" do so by the Promise of Christ, to the End
" of the World.

" It will be proper here to shew you, what
" it is that makes the Difference of Baptisms;
" not the outward Matter in which they are
" administred, for all outward Baptisms were
Water-

“ Water-Baptisms, as the Word Baptism
“ (*Washing*) signifies ; but they differ,

“ 1st. In the Ends for which they were in-
“ stituted,

“ 2dly. In the Form in which they are ad-
“ ministrated.

“ 1st. The End of the Christian Baptism
“ is highly distant and different from the Ends
“ of other Baptisms. The End of the *Jewish*
“ Baptism was to give the Baptized a Title to
“ the Privileges of *Moses*: And the End of
“ *John's* Baptism, was to point HIM who
“ was to come, and to prepare Men by Re-
“ pentance for the Reception of the Gospel.
“ But the End of *Christ's* Baptism was to in-
“ state us in all the unconceivable Glories,
“ and high Eternal Prerogatives which belong
“ to the Members of his Body, of his Flesh,
“ and of his Bones, *Gal. iv. 5.* Henceforth
“ no more Servants, but Sons of God ! and
“ Heirs of Heaven !

“ These are the Ends so far transcendent a-
“ bove the Ends of all other Baptisms, that
“ in comparison, other Baptisms are not on-
“ ly less, but none at all ; like the Glory of
“ the Stars in Presence of the Sun, they not
“ only are lesser Lights, but when he appears,
“ they become altogether invisible.

2dly.

“ 2dly, As to the Form : Persons were bap-
 “ tized unto those whose Disciples they were
 “ admitted by their Baptism. Thus the *Pro-*
 “ *selytes* to the *Jewish Religion* were baptized
 “ unto *Moses* ; and Men were made Disciples
 “ unto *John* by his Baptism : But the Chri-
 “ stian Baptism alone is administred in the
 “ Name of the Father, and of the Son, and
 “ of the Holy Ghost. This is the Form of
 “ the Christian Baptism, and which distin-
 “ guishes it from all other Baptisms whatever,

“ Christ's Baptism could not be *John's*
 “ Baptism, for Christ made Disciples to him-
 “ self, not to *John* ; he lessened *John* : *John*
 “ himself owned, *He (i. e. Christ) must in-*
 “ *crease, but I must decrease,* John iii. 30.
 “ But if Christ did baptize with the Baptism
 “ of *John*, then *John* still increased, and
 “ Christ decreased. Again, all the *Jews*
 “ who had been baptized with *John's* Bap-
 “ tism, did not turn Christians, but those
 “ that did, were baptized over again in the
 “ Name of Christ, of which there is a re-
 “ markable Instance in *Acts* xix. to vers. 7.
 pag. 26, 27, 28.

By the preceding Quotation our Oppo-
 nents may plainly see, that we are not singu-
 lar in maintaining the Abolition and virtual
 Cessation of *John's* Baptism, but have now
 got an Orthodox Champion, an approved
 Warrior

Warrier of the Church of *England* on our Side. To whom also I might add those of the *Clerical Tribe* who approv'd of, if not assisted him in his Performance, as Report goes some of 'em did.

Our Antagonists generally heretofore wou'd not yield that *John's* Baptism was abolished, or allow that those Words, *I must decrease*, related to the Cessation of his Baptism, as plainly foreseeing the fatal Consequences that wou'd necessarily attend such a Concession; for they well knew, if they once acquitted themselves of *John's* Baptism, what a Loss they would be at, to produce a positive Command, or Institution, for the Practice of Water-Baptism. That *John* had a Command to baptize with Water, we freely own; the Text is clear, *John* i. 33. but that any after him had, we are satisfied can never be shewn. Nor shall we upon a strict Examination find, that the Water-Baptism which the Apostles used, both before and after *Christ's Passion*, was any other than the Baptism of *John*.

Having thus briefly touch'd upon what the Author asserts, respecting *John's* Baptism; and previous thereto, replied to what he would infer from *Christ's* submitting unto it; I shall for the more methodical Prosecution of the Discourse, and the Reader's better Intelligence, consider what Reasons and Arguments he far-

ther advances; under these four following Propositions.

1. *That Christ practised Water-Baptism by his Disciples, all the Time he was upon Earth. See Page 29.*

2. *That Christ after his Resurrection commanded his Apostles to baptize with Water. p. 10.*

3. *That the Apostles of Christ, after his Ascension, practised Water-Baptism in Obedience to that Command. p. 17.*

4. *That the Catholic-Church, through every Age to this Day, practised the same Outward Water-Baptism, which the Apostles used. See his 17, 18, 19, Pages.*

In Examination of these Propositions, which may be fairly collected out of what he has laid down, as containing the Scope of the whole, shall be tried the full Strength of his Assertions.

PROPOSITION I.

THAT Christ practised Water-Baptism by his Disciples all the Time he was upon Earth.

For

For Proof of this, he, pag. 16. brings *John* iii. 26. *And they (i. e. John's Disciples) came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all Men come unto him.*

Reply. Tho' these Disciples of *John* said to him by way of Complaint, *Behold the same (i. e. Jesus) baptizeth*; yet were they mistaken herein, for the Text *John* iv. 2. is positive that *Jesus* himself baptized not, but his Disciples. And the same is to be understood in vers. 22. where *Eutbymius* reads it in the Plural Number, *They baptized*, as the Learned *Dr. Fulk* observes on *John* iv. 2.

2. That *Jesus* ordained or instituted any Outward Baptism, the Text is altogether silent, not a Syllable is to be found any way importing it.

3. Inasmuch as it was his Disciples, and not he that baptized; and that it cannot be prov'd that he had instituted any External Baptism; so the Baptism which they administred must be that of *John's*, for several, if not many of 'em, having not long before that Transaction, been *John's* Disciples, and by him recommended to *Jesus*; they might easily continue the Practice of his Baptism without any Command from *Christ* so to do. But suppose it be granted

granted that our Lord did then command Water-Baptism, as he afterwards commanded several *Jewish Rites*, as *Offerings*, and the Preparation of the *Passover*, neither *John's Ministry*, nor the *Mosaic Law* being at that Time ended, what doth it affect us? Since, as * *Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Whitby, &c.* hold, that *John* and the Disciples of Christ, were both at one and the same Time, baptizing with Water, for one and the same End, viz. *That Christ might be made manifest to Israel*: For if the Baptism which they administred, was either *John's*, or used for the same End, the Reader may soon perceive, by inspecting this Author's 26, 27, pages, (or the foregoing Quotation therefrom) under what Category it falls. If it was *John's* (as undoubtedly it was) 'tis abolished: If administred for the same End, it is in comparison of Christ's Baptism, not only "less, but none at all; like the Glory
" of the Stars in Presence of the Sun."

This Proposition, I must say, is rather a meer Fancy than what hath any Foundation in Scripture, just like unto what he has laid down p. 15. viz. "We find it the constant Custom
" to baptize all that were converted to the
" Faith."

'Tis

'Tis admirable, any Person of Sense and Honour, would offer to be so liberal of such dogmatical and positive Assertions, not having any Basis or Corroboration more than his *ipse dixit*. Peruse the four Evangelists throughout, and find one Instance, either of Christ's or his Disciples using Water-Baptism in all their Travels, save that particular Passage of the Disciples when *John* was baptizing in *Enon*, *John* iii. when Christ sent out his Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples, *Mat.* x. *Luke* ix. & x. we do not find that he gave them any the least Instructions concerning Water-Baptism, tho' he gave 'em particular Directions about Preaching, and also of several other Things of far less Moment than Water-Baptism is accounted, yet there's not a Syllable about it, or any Thing tending thereto. In short, they who affirm that Christ practised Water-Baptism by his Disciples, all the Time he was upon Earth, care not how much they say, nor how little they prove.

Under this Head I shall also examine, what our Author infers from the Passage of *Nicomemus*.

“ God (*says he*) has commanded us to be
“ baptized with Water as the Means of Sal-
“ vation.

To prove this positive Assertion, he tells us, our Saviour says, *Except a Man be born of*
of

of Water and the Spirit, be cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, John iii. 5. which plainly shews (saith he) that baptizing or washing with Water must be done, before we can have any Hope of Entrance or Admittance into the Kingdom of God.

Reply, I should scarcely have believ'd that any Protestant, (at this Time of Day at least) unless such as are much bigotted to Priestcraft, would have offered to urge this Text in favour of Water-Baptism, or pretended that it means material Water; that Notion has been so often and clearly refuted by Protestant Writers. The Papists, I know, hold it to be Elementary Water: And that the Reader may see how very harmonious this Author and they are, respecting this Place, I shall collate their Assertions as follows.

Papists.
Our Saviour saith, unless a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, be cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Ergo, It is necessary to be baptized. Bellarm. de Baptismo. lib. i. c. 4. Rhem. in Johan. 3. 5. Synop. Papismi. p. 564.

Norfolk Letter.
Our Saviour says, Except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, be cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, which plainly shews, that baptizing or washing with Water must be done, before we can have any hope of Entrance or Admittance into the Kingdom of God. p. 19, 20.

Where observe, they both maintain it to mean Baptismal Water; and the one is as absolute as the other, *It is necessary*, says *Bel-larm.* &c. *It must be done*, says this *Norfolk Au-thor*. The Answer therefore, which the Learned Dr. *Willet* gave to that Argument of the *Papists* formerly, in Behalf of the *Protestants*, may be a proper Reply to the same Piece of Popery now revived: His Words are,

“ 1. It is not necessary by Water here, to
 “ understand Material Water, but the puri-
 “ fying Grace of Christ, which is called the
 “ *Water of Life*, John iv. 11. Water then is
 “ here added as an Epithet of the Spirit, be-
 “ cause it cleanseth and purgeth as Water,
 “ as John vii. 38. *He that believeth, out of his*
 “ *Belly shall flow Rivers of Water of Life.*
 “ Quid Aqua sit (says Augustine) *Evangelii-*
 “ *um interroga, Inquire of the Gospel what this*
 “ *Water is*; then it followeth, vers. 39. *This*
 “ *spake he of the Spirit.*

“ 2. Why, may not Water be here figura-
 “ tively taken, to express the Working of the
 “ Spirit; as Fire added to the Spirit, *Mat.*
 “ iii. 11. *He shall baptize with the Holy Ghost*
 “ *and with Fire*? What greater Necessity is
 “ there in this Place to understand Water li-
 “ terally, than Fire in the other.” Thus *Wil-*
 “ *let Synop. Papism.* p. 564.

More

14 *The Quaker's Answer to the*

More Authorities for Confirmation:

“ It is not necessary (*says Dr. Fulk against*
 “ *the Papists*) in this Place by Water, to un-
 “ derstand Material Water, but the purifying
 “ Grace of Christ, as in *John iv. 11.*

Peter Martyr saith, “ That Christ would
 “ teach *Nicodemus* a new Regeneration, and
 “ that the same is done by the Spirit, which
 “ he expressed by two Words, namely, by
 “ *Water*, and the *Spirit*: Neither is it against
 “ the Manner of the Scriptures, that the
 “ Grace of God it self should be signified un-
 “ der the Name of Water; for it both wa-
 “ ters and fructifies the Mind and Soul of
 “ the Faithful. Yea, and *John the Baptist*
 “ joins together the Spirit and Fire, *Mat. iii.*
 “ *11. He shall baptize with the Spirit and with*
 “ *Fire*, in which Speech he uttereth one and
 “ the same Thing, under two Manner of
 “ Words, *Loc. Comm. par. 4. cap. 9.*

Piscator on *Mat. iii. 11.* touching upon this
 Text, *John. iii. 5.* affirms, “ That Water
 “ here doth not signifie Baptismal Water,
 “ but the Holy Spirit it self.”

Pool's

* *Piscat. in Johan. iii. 5.* Nisi quis genitus fuerit ex
 Aquâ & Spiritu, &c. Nam Aqua hic non significat A-
 quam Baptismi, alias salus negaretur omnibus non bap-
 tizatis; sed significat ipsum Spiritum sanctum.

Pool's Annot. on the Place. " By Water
 " then we are to understand the Grace of the
 " Holy Spirit, in purifying the Soul, which
 " is fitly represented by the Efficacy of Water.
 " And this purifying refreshing Virtue of
 " the Spirit is promised in the Prophecies that
 " concern the Times of the Messiah, under
 " the mystical Expression of Water. Thus
 " 'tis twofold by *Isaiah*, *I will pour Water*
 " *upon him that is thirsty, and Floods upon the*
 " *dry Ground*, Isa. xlv. 3. And this is imme-
 " diately explained, *I will pour my Spirit upon*
 " *thy Seed*; and the divine Birth follows, *they*
 " *shall spring up as amongst the Grass*. In the
 " same Manner the Effects of the Holy Spirit
 " are expressed by *Ezekiel*, *I will pour clean*
 " *Water upon you, and ye shall be clean*, Ezek.
 " xxxvi. 35. And presently after, *I will put*
 " *my Spirit within you*. Our Saviour instruc-
 " ting a *Pharisee*, to whom the Prophetical
 " Writings were known, expressly uses these
 " two Words, and in the same Order as they
 " are set down there: First *Water* and then
 " the *Spirit*, that the latter might interpret
 " the former; for *Water* and the *Spirit*, by an
 " usual Figure where two Words are em-
 " ployed to signifie the same Thing, signifie
 " *Spiritual Water*, that is, his *Divine Grace*
 " in renewing the Soul; as when the Apostle
 " saith, in Demonstration of the Spirit, and of
 " the Power, to signifie the *Powerful Spirit*.
 " Thus *John the Baptist* foretold of Christ,
 " *that*

“ that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and
 “ Fire, that is, with the Spirit that has the
 “ Force and Efficacy of Fire, to refine us
 “ from Dross and Corruptions. Thus our
 “ Saviour plainly instructs *Nicodemus* of the
 “ absolute Necessity of an inward, spiritual
 “ Change and Renovation, and thereby shew-
 “ ing the Inefficacy of all the Legal Wash-
 “ ings and Sprinklings, that could not puri-
 “ fie and make white one Soul, which were
 “ of high Valuation among the *Jews*.”

* *Grotius* says, The Words, *Except a Man be*
 “ born of Water and the Spirit, are spoken of
 “ the Spirit only : There are two Things put
 “ for one, as in *Mat. iii. 11. Holy Ghost and*
 “ *Fire*, is as much as to say the *Fiery Holy*
 “ *Ghost*, so here *Water and Spirit*, is as much
 “ as to say, *the Watery Spirit*.”

The Learned || *Stephens of Paris*, “ *Except*
 “ *a Man be born of Water and the Spirit*, that
 “ is, the Spirit, which has the Effect of *Water*.
 Matthew

* *Grot.* in *Johan. cap. iii. ver. 5.* *γεννησθαι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, natus fuerit ex Aqua & Spiritu, Exponit jam qualem nativitatem intelligat, ne *Nicodemus* diu-
 tius allegoricæ locutionis ignorantia fallatur. Est autem
 ἓξ ἑκαστοῦ (unum per duo) nam sicut in Spiritu & Ig-
 ne *Mat. iii. 11.* significat per Spiritum Igneum, ita hic
 ex Spiritu & aqua est ex spiritu aqueo.

|| In *Johan. iii. 5.* Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua &
 spiritu, i. e. spiritu qui Officium mundandi habet.

Matthew Henry on the Place says, "The regenerating Work of the Spirit, is compared to Water. To be born again, is to be born of *Water* and of the Spirit, i. e. of the Spirit working like Water, as *Mat. iii. 11.* with the *Holy Ghost* and with *Fire*, means with the *Holy Ghost* as with *Fire*."

Wilson, in his *Christian Dictionary*, Verbo *Water*, renders the Meaning of Water here to be the Efficacy of the *Holy Ghost*, cleansing the Soul as Water doth the Body.

* *Vossius* on this Text says, "Which Place ought to be understood of Inward Regeneration, seeing Water and Spirit are put for *Spiritual Water*."

Stennet in his Answer to *Rassen*, p. 73. mentioning this Text, *John iii. 5.* says, "From whence some concluded Salvation not attainable without Baptism, supposing, to be born of *Water*, signified External Washing, whereas 'tis to be understood of *Internal washing of Regeneration*, *Tit. iii. 5.* for there is the same Reason to interpret Water and the Spirit, the *Water of the Spirit*, or *Spiritual Water* in this Passage, as to under-

C

"stand

* *Qui Locus de internâ regeneratione intelligi debet, cum aqua & spiritus ponantur pro aquâ spiritua-*
li. Thes. Theolo. 20. de Necessit. Baptismi. p. 383.

“ stand *Spirit* and *Fire*, to signify the
 “ *Fire* of the *Spirit*, or *Spiritual Fire*, in the
 “ Words of *John*, Mat. iii. 11. These Terms
 “ of *Fire* and *Water* being frequently used in
 “ the Holy Scriptures, to signify the Sancti-
 “ fying Operation of the *Holy Spirit*.”

Thomas Blake, M. A. in his Treatise of Sa-
 craments, after having premised several Rea-
 sons (partly grounded on the Assertion of o-
 thers, as *Amesius*, *Suarez*, &c.) against the O-
 pinion of those that maintain that by *Water*
 in *John* iii. 5. is meant *Water-Baptism*, sub-
 joins the following Argument to disprove it.

“ That Text which names not *Baptism*,
 “ and cannot be concluded, by any Argu-
 “ ment infallibly cogent, to speak of *Bap-*
 “ tism, cannot inforce an absolute Necessity
 “ of it. This is clear: But this Text names
 “ not *Baptism*, neither is there any Argu-
 “ ment to conclude infallibly that it speaks
 “ of *Baptism*: Probabilities are mention'd,
 “ but no necessary concluding Argument is
 “ produced.

And farther asserts, “ That many parallel
 “ Instances hold, that *Water* there, must be
 “ taken by Way of *Exegesis*, to hold out the
 “ same Thing that was express'd before by
 “ the *Birth of the Spirit*. — And Multitudes
 “ of *Divines* (saith he) so interpret it, (*Gerard*
 “ (says he) in his *Common Places*, reckons up
 “ many

“ many more than I have to consult) then
 “ this Text comes to nothing in this Particu-
 “ lar : And that this should be the Meaning
 “ *Chamier* with fair Probabilities argues ; see-
 “ ing in this Sense, the Words bear an absolute
 “ Truth without any Limitation. All being of
 “ a corrupt Birth, there is a Necessity of a new
 “ Birth, and that by the SPIRIT ; there be-
 “ ing no more Births than that of the Flesh,
 “ which is corrupt, and that of the Spirit,
 “ which comes to heal Corruption.” Thus
Blake, p. 28, 29.

Bishop Taylor says, “ The Water and the
 “ Spirit in this Place, signifie the same Thing,
 “ and by Water, is meant the Effect of the
 “ Spirit cleansing and purifying the Soul, as
 “ appears in its Parallel of Christ baptizing
 “ with the Spirit and with Fire. *Liberty of*
Prophecy, p. 231.

Burkit on the Place, “ *Nicodemus* (says he)
 “ not rightly understanding Christ’s Mean-
 “ ing in the former Verse, our Saviour is
 “ pleased to explain himself in this, and tells
 “ him, That the Birth he spake of, was not
 “ Natural but Spiritual, wrought in the Soul
 “ by the Spirit of God, whose Working is
 “ like Water, cleansing and purifying the
 “ Soul from all sinful Defilement ; learn
 “ hence, that the Regenerating Change is
 “ wrought in the Soul by the SPIRIT of God,
 “ which purifies it from its natural Defile-

ment, and renews it after the Divine Likeness and Image."

* Calvin in his *Institutions* is very express and cogent, co-operating strongly on our Side, "They are DECEIVED (*says he*) who think that in this Place, Mention is made of Baptism, because they hear the Word Water, for after that Christ had declared to Nicodemus the Corruption of Nature, and taught him that *Men must be born again*, because Nicodemus dreamed of a corporeal New Birth, he shews the Manner how God doth regenerate us, namely, by Water and the Spirit; as though he should say by the Spirit, which in cleansing and watering faith-

* Primum in eo falluntur, quod Baptismi mentionem fieri hoc loco putant, quia Aquæ Nomen audiunt. Postquam enim naturæ Corruptionem Nicodemo exposuit Christus, ac renasci oportere docuit, quia ille renascentiam corporalem somniabat, modum hinc indicat, quo regenerat nos Deus, nempe per Aquam & Spiritum; quali diceret per Spiritum, qui purgando & irrigando fideles Animas, vice Aquæ fungitur. Aquam ergo & Spiritum simpliciter accipio pro Spiritu, quia Aqua est. Neque hæc nova est Locutio, prorsus enim cum illa quæ tertio Matthæi capite habetur convenit. Qui sequitur me ille est qui baptizat Spiritu sancto & Igne. Quemadmodum ergo Spiritu sancto & Igne baptizare, est Spiritum conferre, qui in Regeneratione Ignis Officium Naturamq; habet, ita renasci Aquâ & Spiritu nihil aliud est, quam, vim illam Spiritus recipere quæ in Animâ id facit quod Aqua in Corpore. *Instit.* lib. iv. c. xvi. Sect. 25.

ful Souls, answers the Effect of Water. Therefore I take Water and the Spirit simply for the Spirit, which is Water. Neither is this a new Form of Speech, for it directly agrees with that in the third Chapter of *Matthew*, *He that cometh after me is He that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.* Therefore as to baptize with the Holy Ghost and Fire, is to confer the Holy Ghost, which in Regenerating hath the Effect and Nature of Fire; so to be born again of *Water and the Spirit*, is nothing else but to receive that Power of the Holy Ghost, which performs the same Thing in the Soul, that Water doth in the Body. *Instit. lib. iv. cap. xvi. Sect. 25.*

But above all, the Context, the very next Verse, renders it incontestable; *that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit:* And in the 8th Verse, *So is everyone that is born of the Spirit.* In both which Places Water is not named, but the Spirit only, which plainly indicates, that it is the Spirit alone, which produces the New Birth, agreeable to the Apostle, *1 Pet. i. 23. being born again, not of corruptible Seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.* *1 John iv. 7. For God is Love, and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.*

Thus

Thus I think 'tis as clear as the Light at Noon-day, that this Text *John iii. 5*, makes nothing at all for Water-Baptism, but directly against it; so that this Author's confident Assertion above cited; (*viz.* "That God has commanded us to be baptized with Water, as the Means of Salvation") has not any Countenance therefrom: He must then either produce some plain Text, that unexceptionally proves the Point (since it is wholly destitute of Proof) otherwise it will be highly necessary for him (or whoever may espouse his Cause) to acknowledge and retract the Mistake; for it must needs be very unwarrantable, if not presumptuous, to impose so upon the World, and boldly charge God with what he cannot make out.

It methinks it behoved the Author and his Accomplices, seriously to consider what Honour possibly could redound, either to himself, his Community, or the Cause he advocates, by his appearing so evidently repugnant to the Learned Leaders of his Mother-Church. 'Tis unaccountable Precipitancy and confused Disorder, that Men, under Engagement with their Adversaries, should turn their Hostilities against those of their own Party! Such a War is rather intestine and rebellious, than defensive.

To conclude, 'tis very plain and demonstrable, that this Author, both in his Letter,
pag.

pag. 19, 20. and in his second Pamphet, or what he calls a *Reply*, p. 7, 8, and 38. maintains, that this Text *John* iii. 5. declares or sets forth the Baptism of Christ, or that Baptism which Christ instituted, to be continued in his Church. But it is as plain and clear, that the Learned *Grotius*, *Calvin*, *Vossius*, *Martyr*, *Piscator*, *Dr. Willet*, *Dr. Fulk*, *Pool*, &c. do expound it to relate entirely to the cleansing and purifying Operation of the HOLY SPIRIT.

Wherefore it naturally follows, that the Baptism which Christ commanded *Mat.* xxviii. is that of the SPIRIT.

So that if we do but take this *Norfolk* Author's Doctrine in Conjunction with what these Learned and approved *Theologists* have delivered, it effectually establishes our Principles.

PROPOSITION II.

CHRIST after his Resurrection commanded his Apostles to baptize with Water. page 10.

To maintain this, he brings *Mat.* xxviii. 18, 19, 20. after the Quotation whereof, he says, p. 11. " You *Quakers* say, the Baptism here mention'd is not Water-Baptism ; but the
" Baptism

“ Baptism of the Spirit or Holy Ghost. But
 “ (*says he*) I hope to make it plain to you,
 “ that it was not the Baptism of the Spirit or
 “ Holy Ghost; but Water-Baptism; and
 “ that Water-Baptism is the Initiating Rite,
 “ by which all true Believers ought to enter
 “ into the Church of Christ, and is made and
 “ appointed as the Means of Salvation. The
 “ Baptism commanded *Mat. xxviii.* was not
 “ Baptism by the Holy Ghost.”

And to make this apparent, *viz.* That the
 Baptism commanded *Mat. xxviii.* was not the
 Baptism of the Holy Ghost, but that of Wa-
 ter, he proceeding says, “ To be baptized
 “ with the Holy Ghost, signifies to be endued
 “ with the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; which
 “ Gifts are two-fold, *Ordinary* and *Extraor-*
 “ *dinary.*” page 12.

Page. 13. “ The Baptism with the Holy
 “ Ghost, which in Scripture ALWAYS signifies
 “ the being endued with his Extraordinary
 “ Gifts, is now wholly ceased, and the ordi-
 “ nary Communication of God’s Spirit only
 “ remains. Therefore (*says he*) it must be
 “ plain to every impartial Judge, that since
 “ the Baptism with the Holy Ghost is long
 “ ago CEASED, the Baptism in *Mat. xxviii.*
 “ which is still practised, and will continue
 “ to the End of the World, was Water-Bap-
 “ tism.”

Thus

Thus the Author fancies he has made a quick Dispatch of the *Quaker's* Assertion, and quite extirpating the Baptism of the Holy Ghost out of the Christian Church, imagines he hath prov'd the Point at once. But, alas! his whole Building has but one Pillar, and a very feeble one too, to support it, viz. *That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost in Scripture ALWAYS signifies the being endued with his Extraordinary Gifts, such as inables to raise the Dead, speak with Tongues, heal the Sick, &c.* Disprove but this, and his Structure falls.

Therefore, I shall proceed to prove from Scripture and Authority, that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, doth not always in Scripture signify the being endued with what he calls *Extraordinary Gifts*; and that the same is so far from being long ago ceased, that it is the only Essential Baptism to be continued in Christ's Church, throughout the Gospel Dispensation: And consequently, that which is commanded *Mat. xxviii.*

John the Baptist by Divine Inspiration, publicly declared, and that in a very brief and comprehensive Manner, both the Nature and Efficacy of the Baptism of Christ, as is mentioned by all the four Evangelists, *Mat. iii. 11.*

Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 33:
1st. Its Nature, viz. with the *Holy Ghost*.
2dly. Its Efficacy or Operation, viz. with

Fire,

Fire, which clearly implies, that Christ's Baptism with the *Spirit* was to cleanse, refine, and sanctifie the Heart.

Now to demonstrate that this Baptism here mention'd was not restricted to the *Extraordinary Gifts* bestowed on Particulars in the Apostle's Days, but extended to every true Believer, as essentially necessary to Salvation; it is to be observed,

1st. That the Persons, or Audience, to whom *John* directed his Declaration, shews it to be such: *I indeed baptize you, &c.* but *He shall baptize you, &c.* This he directed to the * Multitude indefinitely, without any Restriction; meaning I baptize you, that become my Proselytes, with WATER; but the *Messiah* shall baptize you, and † whoever else shall truly believe in and obey Him, with the HOLY GHOST.

2dly. The Exegetical Term *Fire*, under which he metaphorically expressed its Operation, plainly imports it to be such. The Efficacy of *Fire* is to warm, cleanse, purifie, refine, purge, sanctifie, &c.

And

* Luke iii. 15, 16.

† All that come to him, as *John* the Baptist did with Water, for so lies the Antithesis, says Bishop Taylor, Libert. Proph. p. 231.

And that such Gifts or Measures of the Holy Ghost as produce these or such like Effects in the Soul, are essentially necessary for the Salvation of every true Believer, to the End of the Gospel Dispensation, I presume none professing Christianity will deny.

I shall now produce some Authorities in Confirmation of my Assertion.

Augustine (says *P. Martyr* Loc. Comm. par. 2. C. 2.) * “confesseth, together with many other of the Fathers, that there is a Baptism of the Spirit, and that the Power of the Holy Ghost works in our Minds without outward Signs.

Piscator on *Mat. iii. 11.* “The Baptism of the Spirit regenerates the Hearts of the Elect.”

Pareus on the Place says, “This Baptism of Fire is always necessary in Christ’s Baptism, for every true Believer. †

Cornelius

* Una enim cum aliis Patribus (Augustinus) fatetur esse Baptismum Flaminis, & Vim Spiritus sancti absque externis Symbolis in Animis nostris operari. 84ta Quest. *Pet. Martyris* Locor. Comm. Class. 2d. cap. 2d. Qui baptizat Spiritu sancto, hoc est dat Spiritum sanctum & Vitam eternam Credentibus. *Melancthon*. Oper. par. 3d. p. 208.

† Hic Baptismus Ignis perpetuus est in Christi Baptismo omnibus Fidelibus necessarius.

“ * *Cornelius a Lapide in eund.* For the
 “ Holy Ghost, like Fire, cleanses the Faithful
 “ from Sin; illuminates their Minds, and
 “ kindles Zeal,”

|| *Calvin* says, “ The Word Fire is join’d
 “ with Spirit, because the Filth of Sin is purg-
 “ ed away, just as the Fire refines Gold. See
 also his *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. xvi. sect. 25.

George Peters on *Mark* i. 8. expounding
 these Words, *He shall baptize you, &c.* says,
 “ That is, by the Divine Operation and Vir-
 “ tue of his Holy Spirit, he shall purge your
 “ Souls and Consciences from Sin.”

Dr. Willet speaking of *Mat.* iii. 11. *He shall*
baptize you with the Holy Ghost and Fire, says,
 “ Thereby is signified the internal and forcible
 “ Working of the Spirit, which kindles
 “ Zeal and Love in our Hearts as Fire. *Synop.*
Papif. pag. 562.

The

— * *Spiritus sanctus enim quasi Ignis fideles a Peccato*
expurgat, illuminat, accendit. *This Cornel. a Lapide,*
was a very Learned Man of the Church of Rome, which
approved of his Performances or Commentaries.

|| *Calvin.* Transfertur autem Ignis nomen ad Spiritum : quia sordes non aliter purgat quam Aurum Igni excoquitur, sicut metaphoricè vocatur Aqua, *Johann.* iii. 5. . And in his *Institutions*, Ergo Spiritu sancto & Igne baptizare, est Spiritum conferre, qui in Regeneratione Ignis Officium Naturamque habet, &c.

The Learned Theologist, Matthew Pool (or the Continuers of his *Annotations*) on Mat. iii. 11. says, "He (*i. e.* Christ) shall baptize Men " with another kind of Baptism, the Baptism " of the Holy Ghost, with the Holy Ghost " inwardly washing away their Sins with his " Blood, and sanctifying their Hearts, the " Holy Ghost working in their Hearts like " Fire, purging out their Lusts and Cor- " ruptions, warming and inflaming their " Hearts with the Sense of his Love, and " kindling in them all Spiritual Habits.

Chrysostom on Mat. iii. 11. *Homil. xi.* speaks plain to the Point, " — *Namely, that Christ " baptizeth the Believers with the Holy " Ghost, — and a little lower says, If Christ " had not only baptized the Apostles with " the Spirit, and also daily EVERY ONE who " willingly receive him, there would have " been, peradventure, some room to doubt " concerning the other Part of *John's* Propo- " sition, viz. that Christ would burn up the " chaffy Nature, or the Wicked, with un- " quenchable Fire." By which 'tis very obvi- " ous, that it was *Chrysostom's* Opinion, that the " Baptism of the Holy Ghost declared by *John* the Baptist, as mentioned in all the *Evange-* " *lists,*

* Scilicet & Credentes baptizat Spiritu sancto, — Si- " gatur non & Apostolos baptizasset in Spiritu, & quoti- " die omnes volentes, posset de eo quoque quod simul po- " suit fortasse dubitare, *Chrysost.* in cap. Matt. tertium, " *Homil. xi.*

lists, Mat. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 17. John i. 33. is that wherewith Christ baptizeth all his Followers.

The Commentary of a certain nameless Author, bound up in *Crisostom's* 3d Tome, whom *Erasmus* counts nothing inferiour to *Chrysostom* himself, both in Learning and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, on *Mat. iii. Homil. 3d.* says, "Christ is a Spirit, and the Spirit is an Holy Spirit, the Soul is also a Spirit, the Spirit therefore baptizeth our Spirit with the Spirit.—And the Baptism of the Spirit is effectual, because when the Holy Spirit enters, it encompasseth the Soul, and as it were environing it like as an invincible Wall, preserves it from the Incursion and Prevalence of evil Concupiscence and carnal Thoughts.*

Nolimus. prætermittere, præsertim quum sit hominis eruditi ac facundi & in divinis literis sic exercitati, ut nec quidem sententia hac in parte non cedat Chrysost. Dea. Brasmi. Rec. Lectori Chrysostomi tertii Tomi. pag. 473.

* Christus autem Spiritus est, & Spiritus sanctus Spiritus est, & Anima quoque Spiritus est: ideo Spiritus cum Spiritu Spiritum nostrum baptizat. — Baptismum autem Spiritus proficit, quia ingrediens Spiritus circumplectitur Animum, & quasi muro quodam inexpugnabili circum eam; & non permittit ut carnales concupiscentie & cogitationes prævaleant contra eam. *Chrysost. Tertii Tomi p. 308, 309. Basil. Edit. Anno 1530.*

The Assembly of Divines at Westminster, on Mat. iii. 11. expound the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, to be that inward working Power of the Spirit of Christ, without which none can be saved.

Dr. Barke on Mat. iii. 11. says, "He (i. e. John) declares that Christ should not baptize as he did, with Water, but with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire; that is, should plentifully pour down of the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit upon his PROSELYTES, which like Fire in their Operation, should purifie their Hearts from Sin; consuming their Lusts and Corruptions."

Daniel King, an approved Preacher and Writer amongst the Anabaptists, in his Book, called *The Way to Zion sought out*, maintains, That the Believers have the Baptism of the Spirit still; alledging it from what the Apostle says, 1 Cor. xii. 13. By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be Bond or Free.

The famous Presbyterian Doctor Matthew Henry, in his Exposition of the New Testament, printed Anno 1725, on Mat. iii. 11. saith, "Those that are baptized with the Holy Ghost, are baptized as with Fire; the seven Spirits of God, appear as seven Lamps of Fire, Rev. iv. 5. Is Fire enlightning? So the Spirit is a Spirit of Illumination. Is it warming? And do not their Hearts burn within

“ within them ? Is it consuming ? And doth
 “ the Spirit of Judgment, as a Spirit of Burn-
 “ ing, consume the Dross of their Corrupti-
 “ ons ? Doth Fire make all it seizeth like it
 “ self ? And doth it move upwards ? So doth
 “ the Spirit make the Soul holy like it self,
 “ and its Tendency is Heavenward.”

“ Spiritual Baptism with the Holy Ghost
 “ is necessary to Salvation, says Dr. Fulk of
 Cambridge, on *John* iii.

The Learned *Stephens*, an eminent *Printer*
 at *Paris*, (Author of that elaborate and excel-
 lent Performance, intituled, *Thesaurus Lingua*
Latinae.) in the Notes of one of his Bibles, on
 these Words, *He shall baptize you with the Ho-*
ly Ghost and Fire, says, “ Baptize you with
 “ Fire, that is, he shall purifie you, he shall
 “ procure you Remission of Sins and the
 “ Love of God, and the Love of one ano-
 “ ther. For Fire is a Symbol of Purification
 “ and Love : Or as others expound it, He
 “ shall procure you the Holy Spirit, which

* Ex Glossa Roberti Stephani 1553, Baptizabit item
 vos Igni, hoc est, purgabit vos, conferret vobis Re-
 missionem Peccatorum & Amorem Dei, & inter vos mu-
 tuum. Ignis symbolum est purgationis & Amoris. Ve-
 ut alii, baptizabit Spiritu sancto & Igni, id est, conferret
 Spiritum sanctum qui in Regeneratione Ignis Officium
 Naturamve habet: Corda vestra regenerabit, innova-
 bit & mundabit, in Adoptionemque Filiorum Dei con-
 secrabit.

“ in Regenerating has the Effect and Nature
 “ of Fire, it shall regenerate, renew and
 “ cleanse your Hearts, and shall make you
 “ Partakers of the Adoption of the Sons of
 “ God.”

In the *Common-Prayer Book*, the *Priest* addressing himself to the Congregation, in the Administration of *Publick Baptism*, says,
 “ *Dearly Beloved*, forasmuch as all Men are
 “ conceived and born in Sin, and that our
 “ Saviour Christ saith, *none can enter into the*
 “ *Kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and*
 “ *born anew of Water and the Holy Ghost*: I
 “ beseech you to call upon God the Father,
 “ through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his
 “ bounteous Mercy, he will grant to this
 “ Child that Thing which by Nature he cannot
 “ have, that he may be baptized with
 “ Water and the Holy Ghost.”

Walter Brute, that eminent *Protestant Martyr*, bears a full and plain Testimony to the Spiritual-Baptism, “ Are not all (*says he*) to
 “ be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with
 “ Fire; but yet not with material Fire: no
 “ more is the Lotion of Water corporeally
 “ necessary to wash away Sins, but only SPI-
 “ RITUAL WATER, that is to say, the Wa-
 “ ter of Faith. *Fox's Acts and Monuments*,
 p. 642. 7th Edition.

I shall conclude these Authorities with that excellent Passage of Bishop Taylor, who speaking concerning *Mat. iii. 11.* *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and Fire,* says, “ For
 “ although this was literally fulfilled in *Pentecost*, yet morally there is more in it, for it
 “ is the Sign of the Effect of the Holy Ghost
 “ and his Productions upon the Soul ; and it
 “ was an Excellency of our Blessed Saviour’s
 “ Office, that he baptizes ALL that come to
 “ him, with the Holy Ghost and with Fire :
 “ For so St. John preferring Christ’s Mission
 “ and Office before his own, tells the *Jews*,
 “ not Christ’s Disciples, that *Christ shall baptize THEM with Fire and the Holy Ghost*, that
 “ is, ALL that come to him, as *John the Baptist* did with Water, for so lies the Antithesis. *Liber. of Propb. p. 231.*

Having thus given the Sense and Judgment of the preceding Authors, (to which might be added many others, as *Aquinas, N. Gorranus, Hugo Cardinalis, Erasmus, Beza, &c.*) concerning the Nature, Efficacy and Extent of Christ’s Spiritual-Baptism ; I would upon the whole, observe.

1st, That these Authorities are so far from restricting the Baptism of the Holy Ghost to those Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit bestowed on Particulars in the Apostles Times, as that of *Tongues, Healing the Sick, Raising the Dead, &c.* That they as it were unanimously maintain

maintain it to be that Gift, or Measure of the Holy Spirit, which regenerates and renews the Heart, purges the Conscience, cleanses from Sin, illuminates the Mind, kindles Zeal and Love both towards God and our Neighbour, warms and inflames the Heart with a Sense of God's Love, raises Spiritual Habits in the Soul, &c. Nay, in fine, they seem to ascribe thereto the whole Work of Regeneration and Sanctification produced in the Soul, from a State of Nature, to a perfect Man, in a State of Grace.

2dly, That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is not ceased, the many excellent Effects and Operations which they appropriate thereunto, sufficiently demonstrate; for take away these, and Christianity it self ceaseth.

Wherefore, if this Author will abide by his Position laid down in his 13th Page, as afore cited, he must of Necessity renounce, not only his *Common-Prayer Book* (since it teaches to pray for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost) but likewise, all these above-cited Authors, and Learned *Theologists*, as false Expounders of Scripture; and thereby at once declare himself to be neither *Roman Catholick*, *Church of England Man*, *Presbyterian*, nor *Anabaptist*; inasmuch as among those, are approved Writers of every of these Communities, which may justly be said to represent the Sense and Judgment

Judgment of each Community or Church whereunto they respectively belong.

Whence this Author has imbibed such a Notion about the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, as its being ceased, &c. I shall leave, but most certainly it is a very dark, antisciptural, and antichristian Doctrine, and very necessary to be expelled the Regions of Christianity: What can be more erroneous and heretical, than to go about to exclude out of Christ's Church, his own Baptism with the Holy Spirit, which is the only Essential Baptism; and in the Room thereof, to establish Water-Baptism, as necessary to Salvation, without it.

Is it not surprising! That a certain eminent Person of the County of *Norfolk*, a profess'd Member of the *Church of England* too, should tell the World in Print, *that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost is long ago ceased*; when at the same Time, not only the Rubrick of the said *Church*, whereof he is such a Member, enjoins every Congregation (present at the Administration of Publick Baptism) through the whole Nation, where ever the *Common-Prayer Book* takes Place, to pray for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost: But also, since several Learned *Bishops*, *Theologists*, and approved *Authors* of most Christian Societies, are so pathetic, clear and expresse, in maintaining the Continuance of the same, as a Thing of absolute Necessity

cessity for every true Believer to experience,
in Respect of Eternal Salvation!

'Tis indeed a strange Infatuation, that Men
in their right Senses, should lose themselves so
in Confusion, that whilst they oppose the re-
ligious Principles of others, they should pro-
claim themselves Antagonists to the chief Doc-
tors of their own Church.

The Premises duly considered, I doubt not
but it will appear plain to every unbiaſſed
Reader, that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost
is so far from being ceased, that it is that where-
by Christ our Lord baptizes all his Disciples,
every true Christian, and without which
none can be saved.

And considering it as such, 'tis certainly
most agreeable to conclude, that that was the
very Baptism commanded in *Mat. xxviii. 19.*

And moreover, since our Author makes
the (supposed) Cessation of the Spirit's Bap-
tism, a decisive Argument, to prove that the
Baptism enjoined *Mat. xxviii.* was Water-Bap-
tism, the Proof of the Non-cessation, or Con-
tinuance of the Spirit's Baptism, must by the

D 3

same

* For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body,
whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be Bond or
Free.

same Authority of Reason, be a decisive Argument to prove that the Baptism commanded *Mat. xxviii.* is that of the Spirit. And especially seeing there is but one Baptism to continue in the Christian Church, *Eph. iv. 5.*

Pag. 20. "It is our Saviour's own Words, and Promise, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved,* Mark xvi. 16. What Words (*says this Author*) can be plainer? Baptism is here joined with Faith it self, as necessary to Salvation. * He that believeth and embraceth the Gospel, and thereupon becomes a Profelyte and Disciple of Christ, and receives Baptism the Seal of the New Covenant, shall for all his former Sins receive Pardon, and upon his Perseverance obtain Eternal Life. O glorious Promise! O blessed Means, who can refuse it?"

Reply, We readily grant, that the Baptism here signified, is as necessary to Salvation as Faith it self, *without which,* as the Apostle says, *it is impossible to please God.* This one would think, might sufficiently exclude the Supposal of its being Water-Baptism, since no Protestant (save this Author) as I conceive, will

* The Author has, I suppose, taken these Words from Dr. *Burkit*, for they are the same with his verbatim.

Dr. *Willet* directly contradicts our Author upon this Text, for he says plainly, That Faith is more necessary than Baptism, meaning *Water-Baptism.* Synop. p. 550.

will offer to affirm that Water-Baptism is as necessary to Salvation as *Faith*.

We likewise, with this Author, freely acknowledge, that this Baptism is the Seal of the New-Covenant. And if this be admitted, then it is most evidently that of the Holy Ghost, according to what the Apostle declares in several of his Epistles, 2 Cor. i. 22. *Who hath also sealed us, and given the Earnest of the Spirit in our Hearts.* Eph. i. 13, 14. *In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of Promise, which is the Earnest of our Inheritance, until the Redemption of the purchased Possession unto the Praise of his Glory.* Eph. iv. 30. *And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the Day of Redemption.*

Observe, our Author, and Dr. Burkit too, maintain, that the Baptism mention'd in this Text, *Mark xvi. 16.* is the Seal of the New Covenant; and the Apostle repeatedly told the Believers, that it was the *Holy Spirit whereby they were sealed.* What Words can be plainer? If Baptism is the Seal; and the Spirit that which Seals; then is the Baptism that of the Spirit. The Consequence is undeniable.

These Words of Christ in this Text, are excellently unfolded by those Expressions of the Apostle.

He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, Mark xvi. 16. The Apostle says, In whom after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of Promise, which is an Earnest of our Inheritance, * Eph. i. 13, 14. Here we have, ye believed, answering to be that believeth: And a being sealed with the Holy Spirit, to parallel being baptized: And the Earnest of our Inheritance, corresponding to, shall be saved; for to have the Earnest of the Inheritance, is certainly to be in a State of Salvation, or being saved;

There is, in Reality, a very remarkable Harmony between the Evangelist and the Apostle, in expressing the Terms of Salvation, the First makes it *Faith and Baptism*; the Latter, makes it *Faith and a being sealed with the Holy Spirit*; by which the Latter is explanatory of the Former, and plainly shews what Baptism is there intended. And very significantly may the Baptism of the Spirit be called

“ * They were sealed for the Children of God
 “ by the sanctifying Spirit promised to the Sons of God
 “ which produced a real renovating Change in their
 “ Hearts and Lives, and so was a Pledge and Earnest of
 “ as well as made them meet and fit for, the Heavenly
 “ Inheritance; — The Holy Spirit by sanctifying of
 “ us, doth discriminate and distinguish us from the rest
 “ of the World. — Observe that the Holy Spirit of
 “ God is God; to sanctifie, to seal, to confirm our
 “ Hearts, are divine Operations. Dr. Burkes on Eph.
 i. 13, 14.

the Seal of the New Covenant; for what Soul
soever sensibly experiences its Operation, will
not fail of receiving an Impression of the Di-
vine Image.

Thus I think it is clear even beyond Con-
tradiction, that the Baptism mentioned *Mark*
xvi. 16. and also that in *Mat* xxviii. (which is
the same) is not Water-Baptism, but the
Baptism of the Holy Ghost. So that the Ar-
guments, or Reasons, this *Norfolk* Author has
alleged, turn to a full Demonstration of the
direct contrary to that for which he produced
them; and have thoroughly established and
confirm'd our Doctrine, of the Necessity and
Sufficiency of the Inward and Spiritual-Bap-
tism.

PROPOSITION III.

THAT the Apostles after Christ's Ascension,
did practise Water-Baptism, in Obedience
to his Command, *Mat.* xxviii. pag. 15.

For Probation of this he says, " When
" Christ sent his Apostles to convert all Na-
" tions, his Commission to them was, to
" baptize them, *Go teach all Nations, baptiz-*
" *ing them,* *Mat.* xxviii. 19. that is, all those
" who shall receive your Word: According-
" ly it is said, *They that received the Word were*
" *baptized,*

“ *baptized*, Acts ii. 41. pursuant to what the
 “ Apostle had preached to them ver. 38. *Re-*
 “ *pent and be baptized.* pag. 15.

Reply, He endeavours here to make the Baptism mention'd Acts ii. 41. to run parallel with Mat. xxviii. 19. because it is said, *they that received the Word were baptized*, Acts ii. 41. But this makes nothing for his Purpose, since we maintain that it is by the Reception of the Word, the Baptism of the Spirit is experienced or known; unless People receive the Presentations of the Gospel, whether immediately or instrumentally dispensed or conveyed, there is no Probability of their being baptized with the Spirit: But admitting the Baptism signified Acts ii. 38. was that of Water, notwithstanding the very Words of the Apostle there expressed, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins*, shew it to be in Reference to John's Baptism, (see Mark i. 14. Luke iii. 3.) and not to that commanded Mat. xxviii. 19. which was to be *in*, or rather *into*, the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Dr. Willet, when pleading the Protestant Cause against the Papists, says, “ John preach-
 “ ed the Baptism of Repentance to Remission
 “ of Sins, Luke iii. 3. which is ALL ONE with
 “ the Baptism which Peter ministred Acts ii.
 “ 38. *Repent and be baptized in the Name of the*
 Lord

“ Lord Jesus for Remission of Sins : Repentance
 “ and Remission of Sins, is the Scope of
 “ John's and Peter's Baptism. *Synopsis Pa-*
pismi pag. 585.

Ambros. lib. 1. *de Spiritu*, cap. iii. “ Jo-
 “ hannes Remissionem Peccatorum in Ad-
 “ venientes Jesu nomine non in suo baptiza-
 “ bat.” See also *Calvin's Institut.* lib. 4. cap.
 15. Sect. 7. where the same is maintained.
 'Tis evident then, from the express Doctrine
 of the Church of England, as laid down by her
 famous Apologist *Andrew Willet D. D.* and
 consonant to the Testimony of *Ambrose* Bishop
 of *Milain*, and also of *Calvin*, that the Bap-
 tism mentioned *Acts* ii. 38. was no other than
John's.

Pag. 15. “ And we find it the constant
 “ Custom to baptize all those that were con-
 “ verted to the Faith.”

Reply, This is a great Mistake, let him
 read *Acts* ix. 35. where he may find, that all
 the Inhabitants of *Lydda* and *Saron* were con-
 verted by the Ministry of *Peter*, but not a
 Syllable of Water-Baptism.

Acts ix. 42. That the Dwellers at *Joppa*
 were converted, but not any Account of their
 being baptized.

Acts

Acts xiii. 6, 7, 8, 12. That *Sergius Paulus* the Deputy was converted, but not a Tittle of his being baptized.

Acts xiii. 48. Relates the Conversion of the Gentiles at *Antioch*, but not a Word of Water-Baptism.

Acts xvii. 1, 2, 3, 4. Informs us, that at *Thessalonica* a great Multitude of the *Greeks*, and many of the chief Women believed; but it appears not that any of 'em received Water-Baptism.

In *Acts* xvii. 11, 12. we have an Account, that many at *Berea*, both *Jews* and *Greeks*, believed; but we do not find that any of them were baptized,

With what Face then could our Author affirm, That we find it the constant Custom to baptize ALL those that were converted; when we cannot find the least Hint, or most distant Intimation of Water-Baptism, at any one of those Places abovesaid, tho' such particular Mention is made of so many being converted, or turned to the Faith?

Ibid. " Thus *Paul*, tho' miraculously converted from Heaven, was commanded to be baptized, *Acts* xxii. 16. He baptized *Lydia*, the *Taylor*, and their Household, as soon as he had converted them, *Acts* xvi.

“ 15, 33. And the *Corinthians*, Acts xviii:
 “ 8. And the Disciples of *John*, who had not
 “ yet been made Christians, Acts xix. 5. Philip
 “ baptized the *Eunuch*, as soon as he believ-
 “ ed in Christ, *they went down into the Water*,
 “ both Philip and the *Eunuch*, and he baptized
 “ him, Acts viii. 38. And *Peter* immediately
 “ upon the Conversion of *Cornelius* and those
 “ with him, said, *Can any forbid Water that*
 “ *these should not be baptized?* Acts x. 47. It
 “ was so well known to be the initiating Rite
 “ into the Christian Church, that whoever
 “ became a Convert, immediately requested,
 “ whether *Jew or Gentile*, Water-Baptism.”

Reply, That *Paul* was baptized with Wa-
 ter by *Ananias*, is not granted, nor has he
 prov'd it. That *Paul* baptized *Lydia*, the
Tailor, and their Households; or any of the
Corinthians, save *Crispus* and *Gaius*, doth not
 cohere with 1 Cor. i. 16. That he baptized
 the Disciples of *John*, Acts xix. 5. is an old
Popish Plea, but as diametrically opposite to
 the Testimony of many *Protestant* Writers, as
 the *Zenith* and *Nadir* are to each other. *Calvin*
 says positively, “ I deny that they were bap-
 “ tized again. What then must we under-
 “ stand by these Words, *They were baptized in*
 “ *the Name of the Lord Jesus?* Some (*says he*)
 “ expound it, That they were but instructed
 “ of *Paul* with true Doctrine; but I had ra-
 “ ther understand it more simply, to be the
 “ Baptism of the Holy Ghost. And then he
 proceeds

proceeds to prove the Assertion, see his *Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 15. Sect. 18. *

Dr. *Willet* strongly maintains the Negative of *Paul's* re-baptizing the *Ephesian* Disciples with Water, against the *Papist's* Doctrine, *Synop. Paptismi*, p. 584, and 585. which Book was written in Defence of the Church of *England*, and published by the King's Authority.

Dr. *Falk* of *Cambridge*, on the Place against the *Rhemists*, holds the same, viz. That they were not baptized again; and his Book was likewise published by the King's Authority. How odd it looks, that this *Norfolk* Author should run so directly retrograde to the Doctrine of his Forefathers; and especially to what had the Countenance and Validity of Supreme Authority too!

The Assembly of *Divines*, in their Annotations on the Place; and also the Learned *Bareus* on *Mat.* iii. hold, that these *Ephesians* mentioned *Act.* xix, 5. were not re-baptized.

* Sed rebaptizatos nego: Quid igitur sibi volunt Verba baptizati sunt in nomine Jesu? Quidam interpretantur, tantum sinceram Doctrinam eruditos a Paulo fuisse, sed simplicius intelligere malim, Baptismum Spiritus sancti. *Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 15. sect. 18.

Parab. In hunc Locum, Baptismo Christi baptizati sunt, hoc est Baptismo Spiritus non Aquæ.

The *Annotators* on the Bible (as *Ellwood* observes) in their Marginal Note to this Place, upon these Words vers. 5. *They were baptized*, say, [indued with the visible Graces of the Holy Ghost] they do not make the second Baptism to be that of Water, but to be indued with the visible Graces of the Spirit. Agreeable to Dr. Dell of Cambridge, Calvin, Vatablus, &c.

Dr. Thomas Taylor, who was Priest at Aldermanbury, London, in his Exposition upon Peter's Sermon before Cornelius, Vol. i. of his Works, fol. 303. maintains, that Paul did not re-baptize those *Ephesian* Disciples Acts xix. and represents it to be a false Notion of the *Anabaptists*, to hold that they were re-baptized by Paul, who were before baptized by John; so he is directly opposite to Bedingfield and his Adherents.

That Philip baptized the Eunuch with Water, we question not; but that he baptized him in pursuance to Christ's Command, Mat. xxviii. we do not believe can ever be proved. It seems most probable by the concurring Circumstances, to have been in Relation to John's Dispensation. 1st. It does not appear that the Action sprang from any Motion in Philip, but from the Eunuch's Request; See here is Water, what hindreth me to be baptized? Which Words shew that the Eunuch understood that Water-Baptism was then in Use; which

which he well might, being himself a Profelyte to the Jewish Religion, on the Account of which, he had then been at Jerusalem, where he could not easily miss of being informed of the so noted Administration of Water-Baptism by John the Baptist. And it is evident, that John's Baptism was in practice a long Time after that, see *Acts* xix. 3.

2dly, The prerequisite Qualification for the Reception thereof, agrees with that of John's. A Belief in Christ was the Terms upon which the Eunuch was baptized. When John baptized, he said unto the People, *that they should believe on him which should come after him*, that is, on Christ Jesus, *Acts* xix. 4.

3dly, Philip's answering so coolly in the permissive Form, [Thou mayst] denotes it to be a Matter of Indifference, and not that which Christ had so solemnly enjoyn'd, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. and *Mark* xvi. 16, which this Opponent pag. 20. asserts, *to be as necessary as Faith itself, the sine qua non.* †

As touching Cornelius's being baptized, 'tis to be considered, that he being a devout Man,

* No less than 30 Years from the Death of John. *Synop. Papismi* p. 584.

† The Instance he supposes p. 18. of his 2d (or which he calls a *Reply*) might easily enough be improved to an Argument evidently destructive to his Cause.

of good Report among all the Nation of the *Jews*, could not well be ignorant of the Ministration of *John*, to which the generality of the *Jews* at first, to whom it properly belonged, and many *Jewish* Converts since, had in Reference thereto submitted, might very probably request that the same might be administered to him and his Fellow-Converts: "Whoever became a Convert, (says this Author) immediately REQUESTED Baptism; and *Peter* not willing to disappoint such a Request and Expectation — But well knowing that Water-Baptism was *John's* Ministration, and related more peculiarly to the *Jews* (according to *John* i. 29, 31.) and this being the first Instance of *Gentile* Conversion to Christianity, might well doubt whether it might be applied to the *Gentile* Converts; he therefore puts the Question to the *Jewish* Brethren who came with him, saying, *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* And they either expressly or tacitly signifying their Consent, he commanded * them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord."

Now one wou'd think his asking the Question, *Can any Man forbid, &c.* which was evidently an appealing to the Judgment of Men

Even respecting

* *Cornelius* and his Company.

respecting the Fitness and Unfitness of the Action, plainly enough shews, it was not the Baptism enjoined in Christ's Commission *Mat. xxviii.* For observe, that when the Apostle was fully convinced by the Vision, and *Cornelius's* Declaration, that the *Gentiles* were the Subjects of the Gospel, he made not any Hesitation, by what appears, or in the least consulted or appeal'd unto any, whether he might preach the Gospel unto them. But *when Cornelius had done speaking*, the Text says, *then Peter opened his Mouth and said, O a Truth, &c.* He did not first query whether any Man could forbid Preaching, that these should not have the Glad Tidings of Salvation published to them, since it was apparent that they were the Subjects thereof as well as the *Jews*, no such Thing; he well knew this was not a Matter to be subjected to the Judgment or Determination of Men, or that there was any Need of appealing to have their Sentiments concerning it, (though this was the principal and most material Point) as being sensible that it was his indispensable Duty, and that no Man either ought or could forbid it:

And had he understood Water-Baptism to have been that expressed in the Commission to preach the Gospel, *Mat. xxviii.* he would not undoubtedly, have made any more Hesitation, or asking of Questions about his administering the One than the Other; seeing his Authority

Authority would have been equally indisputable, and his Duty indispensable in both.

But inasmuch as the Apostle, when once he perceived that these *Gentiles* were the Subjects of the New Covenant, did not at all hesitate, ask or wait for, any Man's Consent or Approbation for the Performance of the One, but did for the Other; we cannot but conclude, that these two Actions, *viz.* His preaching the Gospel to 'em, and his commanding them to be baptized with Water, proceeded from two different Motives.

But let us hear what our Author says, p. 14. about this Passage, "It is plain (*says he*) "upon St. *Peter's* preaching his Sermon, the "Holy Ghost fell upon the *Gentiles*, who "spake with Tongues and magnified God; "whereupon *Peter* appealed to the People, "whether this was not a clear Evidence, that "God intended these Men the Blessings of "the Gospel Covenant, and that having the "extraordinary Gifts, they might and ought "to be baptized with Water into the Christian Profession.

Reply, That *Peter's* saying, *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, &c.* was an Appeal to the People, whether God intended these Men the Blessings of the Gospel Covenant, seems to be inconsistent with the Case relating to real Matter of Fact.

1st, It represents it as if the *Gentiles* had not then received the Blessings of the Gospel, but that the same were only INTENDED them, whereas they were evidently in the Fruition thereof, and that in an extraordinary Degree they were so effectually indued and replenished with the Holy Ghost, that they spake with Tongues and magnified God; which was a Participation of the Gospel Covenant with a Witness.

2dly, How imprudentially doth it represent the Apostle to act in this Affair! It makes him first to use his utmost Endeavour to unfold the Divine Mysteries, and to be instrumental to dispense and communicate unto them the Blessings of the Gospel Covenant, and they by and under his Ministry becoming abundantly Partakers thereof; and yet afterwards, that he should appeal to the People, whether God INTENDED them such!

Had the Apostle been in Doubt, and wanted to appeal to the People, whether God intended these Men the Blessings of the Gospel Covenant, surely the proper Time to have done this, was before he opened his Mouth, or began his Sermon, and not first to preach a Sermon on purpose that they might, and whereby indeed they apparently did, receive the Blessings of the Gospel Covenant; and then afterward to ask whether God INTENDED them!

How

How palpably absurd and preposterous both it render the inspired Apostle's Proceedings herein ! And yet such is the natural Consequence of this Author's Assertion.

'Tis very clear, that the End of *Peter's* asking the Question, was only to know, whether they might receive Water Baptism, since very probably they themselves had requested it, and waited in Expectation thereof, agreeable to what our * Author himself says, but that it was no other than *John's*, the Form in which *Peter* commanded them to be baptized, viz. *In the Name of the Lord*, fully evinces, as will hereafter farther appear.

And why *Peter's* thus commanding these *Gentiles* to be baptized with Water, after they had received the Baptism of the Spirit, should any more infer the Necessity of Water-Baptism, than his compelling (which was more than commanding) the *Gentiles* to live as did the *Jews*, Gal. ii. 14. after the Abbrogation of the Law, and Commencement of the Gospel-Dispensation, infers the Necessity of observing *Jewish* Rites and Ceremonies, has not yet been demonstrated ; nor has this Author at all attempted it, tho' 'twas certainly incumbent upon him.

E 3

And

* Whoever became a Convert, whether *Jew* or *Gentile*, immediately requested Water-Baptism.

And what doth he talk of their being baptized with Water into the Christian Profession, when 'tis undeniable that they were not only in the Profession, but also in the Possession of Christianity, before they received Water-Baptism?

Doth he imagine they were so plentifully filled with the Holy Ghost (the Blessed Comforter which Christ told his Apostles should guide them into all Truth, and bring all Things to their Remembrance) as to speak with Tongues, magnifie God, &c. and yet all the while destitute of the Christian Profession, incapable, or not qualified to profess Christ, until they received the Elementary Water? An empty weak Notion, and fit to be exploded the Christian World!

Moreover, since this Champion so frequently and confidently asserts, that Water-Baptism is the initiating Rite, or Entrance into Christ's Church, the Door of Salvation, &c. I would ask, whether he will allow that *Cornelius* was a Member of Christ's Church or Mystical Body, and in a State of Salvation before he was baptized with Water? * *Augustine* says, "*Cornelius* hearing and believing that
"which

* *Cornelius*, audiens & credens quod prædicaverat Petrus, ita mundatus sit, ut ante visibilem Baptismum, cum eis qui aderant, acciperet donum Spiritus sancti. 33 quest. Tom. 4.

which *Peter* preached, was so CLEANSED, that before visible Baptism, he with his that were present received the Gift of the Holy Ghost." If he and they were so sanctified or cleansed, by the Divine Power accompanying, or dispensed through the Ministry of *Peter*, as to become fit Receptacles for the abundant Effusion of the Holy Ghost, wherewith they were so miraculously replenished, and consequently Members of Christ's Church, and in a State of Salvation, prior to their Reception of Water-Baptism; how can it be rationally supposed, much less positively asserted, that it was their Entrance or Door thereinto; unless it be no Absurdity to maintain, that they (i. e. *Cornelius* and his Company) had free Ingression into the Church and Salvation, before ever they arrived at the Entrance and Door thereof?

Pag. 14. He tells us, "The Church is an outward and visible Society, our Saviour, says he, calls it a City that is set on an Hill, Mat. v. 14. And as it is so, has an outward and visible Form of admitting Men into it."

Rep. Dr. Willet, personating the Protestants, says, "Concerning the Catholick Church, we hold, that because it is an Article of our Faith, it is always unto the World INVISIBLE, and NOT to be espied but by the Eye of Faith, *Synop. Papismi* p. 67.

“ —The Foundation of the Church, which
 “ is *Faith*, is invisible; therefore the Church
 “ is invisible. *Ibid.* p. 66.

“ To the *Hebrews*, (says he) it is thus writ-
 “ ten, chap. xii. ver. 18, 23, 24. *Ye are not*
 “ *come to the Mountain which might be touched,*
 “ *but to the City of the Living God, the celesti-*
 “ *al Jerusalem, &c.* Ergo, (says he) the
 “ Church is invisible, and here opposed to
 “ the visible Hill of Sinai. *Ibid.* p. 67.

P. Martyr, Loco. Comm. par. 2: cap. 18. saith
 “ That the Church is a mystical Body. the
 “ which is governed by the Holy Ghost.—
 “ Moreover 'tis very clear, how aptly the
 “ Name of Church agreeth thereto, first,
 “ it is evidently proved, that this marvellous
 “ Body is governed by the Holy Ghost, by
 “ what *Paul* saith to the *Epbesians*, *We*, says
 “ he, *are one Body and one Spirit.* Again, al-
 “ so it is more plainly set forth in the first E-
 “ pistle to the *Corinthians*, *By one Spirit we*
 “ *are all baptized into one Body, and have all*
 “ *drank of One Spirit*; whence it follows, that
 “ whoever are destitute of that Spirit, do not
 “ belong to this Body; for he that hath not
 “ the Spirit of Christ, what Assurance can he
 “ have, that he is a Member of that Body
 “ whereof Christ is the Head, and in whom
 “ there is no other Life than the Divine Spi-
 “ rit? Undoubtedly it sufficeth not, it suffi-
 “ ceth not, I say, to put on certain colourable
 “ Shews,

“ Shews, whereby we may be esteemed in the
 “ Judgment of Men to be Members of that
 “ Body. *Peter* was called of Christ, *Blessed*,
 “ not because he confessed him with the out-
 “ ward Voice to be the Son of God ; but be-
 “ cause neither Flesh nor Blood, nor any hu-
 “ mane Reason had revealed to him so great
 “ a Mystery, but only the Heavenly Fa-
 “ ther.” *

If the Church of Christ is a Mystical and Spiritual Body, as the Head thereof is Spiritual, how absurd and irrational is it, to affirm, that the same must have a natural and elementary Door? As if a Spiritual Building or Habitation

* *Ecclesiam mysticum esse Corpus, quod a Spiritu sancto regatur. Præterea non est Obscurum, quam apte, Ecclesiæ nomen conveniat. Primum, admirandum illud Corpus a divino Spiritu gubernari, ex iis quæ Paulus docet in Epistola ad Ephesios, dilucide probatur: Nos, inquit, sumus unum Corpus, & unus Spiritus. Deinde etiam magis perspicue in Epistola ad Corinthios priorē: Nos in idem Corpus eodem Spiritu baptizati sumus, & omnes ex uno Spiritu potum hausimus. Unde sequitur, quicumque eo Spiritu vacui sunt, non pertinent ad istud Corpus. Etenim qui Spiritum Christi non habet, quī confidet se esse ipsius Corporis membrum, cujus Christi Corpus est & cui nulla alia Anima inest, quam divinus ipse Spiritus? Certē non sufficit, non sufficit, inquam, prætextus quosdam induere, quibus illius Corporis membra hominum iudicio æstimemur. Petrus a Christo beatus dictus est, non quod externā voce illum Filium Dei esset confessus: verum quoniam neque caro, neque sanguis, aut humana ulla ratio tantum ei mysterium revelasset, sed solummodo Pater Cœlestis.*

bitation required a material Door! A Doctrine as dissimilar, unnatural and monstrous, as that of the *Pope's* Supremacy, which implies the Church to have two Heads!

'Tis Matter of Admiration that any *Protestant*, at least, should pretend to assert, that Water-Baptism is the Door of Salvation, &c. whereas Christ our Blessed Lord and Redeemer declared himself to be the *Door*. John x. 7, 9.

There is nothing more certain and evident than this, *viz.* That it is not by Water-Baptism, but by the Baptism of the Spirit, that all Christians, or true Believers, are initiated into the mystical Body or Church of Christ; according to the Apostle 1 Cor. xii. 13. *By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether Bond or Free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* And Eph. ii. 18. *For through him, we both (i. e. Jew and Gentile) have an Access by One Spirit unto the Father.*

Were it not for Brevity Sake, and that I think the plain Texts are sufficient, I could bring in the Testimonies of * several Authen-

tick

* *Doctrine of Baptism*, p. 12. *P. Marry* on 1 Cor. xii. 13. says, *Id non sic exponendum est, quasi per externum Baptismum in corpus Christi primum transeamus, cum prius de corpore Christi fuerimus. Prius ergo efficitur*

tick Writers in Opposition to that ridiculous and intolerable Conceit of Water-Baptism's being the * Initiation or Entrance into the Christian Church, and Door of Salvation, as this Norfolk Author affirms.

Pag. 10. He says, *That God took away Circumcision, and commanded Water-Baptism to be sealed in its Room.*—But it is plain and undeniably evident from Rom. ii. That Inward Circumcision, and not Water-Baptism, is opposed to Outward Circumcision. That the Jewish Circumcision was typical, and had its Antitype in the Gospel, I suppose will be readily granted: And what this Antitype is, the Apostle, when distinguishing between the Jewish

ficatur Spiritus sancti Operâ, ut abeamus in membra Christi. *Locor. Comm. Classis 4ta. cap. 9. §. 19. London Edit.*

* Since (a) Basil Bishop of Cesarea, his Father being Bishop of Nisen. (b) Constantine the great. (c) Theodosius the Emperor. (d) Augustine. (e) Gregory Nazianzen. (f) Ambrose. (g) Jerom. (h) Chrysostom Bishop of Constantinople, &c. though all descended from Christian Parents, were not baptized till advanced to Maturity, yea some of 'em not till aged; it is a plain Indication that Water-Baptism was not then counted an initiatory Rite or Entrance into the Church, and likewise that Infant-Baptism is an Innovation.

(a) Osiand. cent. 4. lib. 3. (b) Soetat. Schol. lib. 1. cap. 26. (c) Historia Tripartita lib. 1. (d) White's Apology. (e) Osiand. cent. 4. lib. 3. (f) Paulinus in vita Ambrosii. (g) Erasmus in vita Hieron. (h) Grotius Mat. 19. 14.

Jewish and Christian Circumcision, very clearly sets forth in these Words, And Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit and not in the Letter, whose Praise is not of Men, but of God. Rom. ii. 29.

Having touched a little in particular, upon these Passages in the *Acts* of the Apostles, relating to their using Water-Baptism; I shall treat somewhat of the same in general, and advance some Reasons and Authorities, in order more fully to demonstrate, that their Practice in that Case was not in pursuance of the Command of Christ, *Mat. xxviii.* but rather in Condescension with Reference to the Baptism of *John*.

1st. 'Tis evident, that the Apostle *Paul* had not a Commission to baptize with Water, his own Words declare it, * *1 Cor. i. 17.* For (says he) *Christ sent me NOT to baptize,* (i. e. with Water, for such a Baptism is there implied) and if he was not commanded to administer Water-Baptism, it must be very inconsistent to affirm, that any of the rest of the Apostles were; for this would make * *Paul's* Commission inferior to theirs; whereas him-
self

*Several of the Advocates of Water-Baptism, finding themselves beset and deeply distressed, by what the Apostle has delivered *1 Cor. i. 17. Christ sent me not to baptize, &c.* have had Recourse to divers Stratagems and

self plainly asserts, *that he was not a Wit behind the chiefest of the Apostles.*

2dly,

and Devices, among whom *Oswald Edwards* an *Anabaptist* Preacher in *Dublin*, is not the least concerned, who in his Answer to *Joseph Gill*, p. 77, 78, 79. holds that the Word NOT is not a Term of Exclusion (as he calls it) but stands for not chiefly, principally, &c. P. 77. he says, "That *Paul* thanked God that he baptized so few of them, and that for fear any should say he baptized in his own Name."

Our *Norfolk* Author p. 23. of his Reply says, "The Apostle does not thank God that he had not baptized, but that he had not baptized such Persons as were like to make so ill Use of it, as to say he baptized in his own Name."

Ibid. p. 24. He ventures to expound the Apostle's Meaning thus, viz. "I am not obliged by my Commission to baptize Every Convert I make with my own Hands, my proper Business is to preach and convert as many as I am able, being at Liberty whether I will baptize them my self, or leave that Part of the Office to subordinate Ministers."

Ans^r. 'Tis allowed, that *Paul* thanked God that he baptized so few of them, for fear any should say he baptized in his own Name.—And that he was glad that he had not baptized such Persons as were like to say he baptized in his own Name.—But they have not, either of 'em inform'd us, why the Apostle should have been any more suspicious or fearful of their saying, that he baptized in his own Name, than that he Preached in his own Name; if he had had a Commission for the one as well as the other; since 'tis evident enough, and I think generally held, that the *Corinthian's* Contention and Variance, was rather about their Ministers and Teachers, than Baptizers: "There were great Divisions and Contentions (says our *Norfolk* Author, p. 23.) among these *Corinthians*, which were grounded upon the Emulation

2dly, When they did baptize with Water, it cannot be proved, that they used those Words

“ Emulation that arose among them in Behalf of their several Teachers.”

The Apostle is so far from any Apprehension of such a Construction being put upon his Preaching the Gospel, that he pathetically illustrates and magnifies his Office herein, as it were even to the highest Degree, declaring that it was in Demonstration of the Spirit and Power, chap. ii. ver. 4. *Though you have Ten Thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many Fathers; for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the Gospel,* chap. iv. 14. *For Necessity is laid upon me; yea Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel,* chap. ix. 16.

That the Baptism which the Apostle administered was commanded him by Christ, as well as his Office of Preaching the Gospel, and consequently the first as necessary to Salvation as the last, and yet that he should speak so very indifferently, nay disavourably of the first, as not only to express Gratitude and Thankfulness for the Smallness of his Administration thereof; but also plainly to say, that Christ sent him not to do it, and to give such a quite contrary Relation concerning his Administration of the last, though what is assigned as the Cause of his so expressing himself concerning the first, is equally affecting the last; are Points that want a Reconciliation, and which none of our Opponents have attempted to accomplish, though the same is no more than what their own Assertions necessarily enjoin 'em.

As to the other Part of their Doctrine, the one of 'em makes the Apostle say, *Christ sent me not chiefly or principally to baptize*; the other compels him to speak thus, *Christ sent me not to baptize Every Convert I make with my own Hands*. What can be more notoriously perverting than such an unwarrantable Addition to the Sacred Text! It forces a Sense from the Apostle (in favour of their Notion) directly repugnant to his express Words.

of *Christ*, which some count essential to *Baptism*
Mat. xxviii. 19. viz. In the Name of the Fa-
ther,

Words. He positively says, *Christ sent me not to baptize*; but they represent him to say, *Christ sent me to baptize*.

Now whether is it more reasonable for us to abide by the holy Apostle, and to believe that he spoke in an Acceptation pursuant to his Thoughts; or adhere to such perverting Glosses, as maintain that he spoke quite contrary to his Intention?

As for my Part, I do not see the least Inducement from what any of our Antagonists have advanced, to entertain any other Opinion than that the Inspired Apostle spoke just as he intended, and surely he knew his own Meaning best.

'Tis an approved Maxim in Divinity, *that we ought not to go from the Literal Signification of the Text, except some urgent Necessity force us thereunto*.

But no urgent Necessity in this Text, *1 Cor. ii. 17.* forceth us thereunto: The most accomplished and sagacious of our Opponents, is not able to produce one single Text that doth declare that Water-Baptism was either in *Paul's*, or any other of the Apostle's Commission. Therefore we ought not to go from it.

What our Antagonists have to alledge, is only something of Example, or the Apostles sometimes using Water-Baptism: But upon the same Foundation may we urge the Practice of Community of Goods, Circumcision, abstaining from Blood and Things Strangled, washing of one another's Feet, anointing the Sick with Oil, &c.

"Nothing can make Scripture Examples of perpetual Obligation, but the Moral Nature of the Action; or a positive Law." *

As

ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; but baptized only in the Name of the Lord, or Lord Jesus. Acts viii. 16.—xvi. 48.

And that the same was the very Form which *John the Baptist* used, observe these following Authorities.

Ambrose (as before cited) says, “ *John* baptized in the Name of Christ, not in his own Name, for the Remission of Sins.”

Gregory Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, who flourished in the Beginning of the Third Century, maintains, in his Exposition of *Mat. iii. 14.* That *John* baptized in the Name of Jesus. Du Viel on *Acts xix. 5.*

Tertullian makes *John's* Baptism and what the Apostle used, the same.*

Calvin saith, “ That both *John* and the Apostles baptized in the Name of Christ ;

As to what the Author says about *Subordinate Ministers*, it has not any Footsteps in the Sacred Pages, but is only a Notion invented to evade the Force of the Text, and the more aptly to suit the Order of the Clergy, as *Bishops, Doctors, Curates, &c.*

* Nec quicquam refert inter eos, quos *Johannes* in Jordane, & quos *Petrus* in *Tiberi* tinxit. Lib. de Baptismo.

for (*says he*) the diverse Hands wherewith
it is administred, makes not the Baptism
diverse; but the same Doctrine shews it to
be the same Baptism. *John* and the Apo-
stles agreed in one Doctrine, both baptized
unto Repentance, both for the Remission of
Sin, both into the Name of Christ. Instit.
lib. iv. cap. xv. Sect. 7. *

Dr. *Willet* speaking of the *Ephesians*, Acts
xix. 4, 5. says, "They had received the
Baptism of *John*, which was nothing but to
be baptized in the Name of Jesus." *Synop.*
Papismi p. 585.

Ibid. "John used the same FORM in bap-
tizing, which the Apostles did; they bap-
tized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, Acts
ii. 38. and so did John."

Dr. *Fulk* on Acts xix. 4. says, "They that
heard John's Doctrine, were baptized in
the Name of the Lord Jesus." See also
Dr. *Lightfoot's* Harmony, p. 15, 105.

F

Now

* *Calvin.* Non enim alium Baptismum faciunt diver-
sæ manus, quibus ministratur; sed eundem esse eadem
doctrina ostendit. In unam doctrinam Johannes & A-
postoli consenserunt: utrique in penitentiam, utrique
in Remissionem Peccatorum: utrique in nomen Christi,
a quo, penitentia & Peccatorum Remissio est, baptiza-
runt. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 15. S. 7.

Now if the Apostles had understood these Words of Christ in *Mat. xxviii. 19. In the Name of the Father, &c.* to relate to Water-Baptism as a Form to be used, when they baptized therewith, 'tis certainly most reasonable to conclude, that they would rather have followed and practised that which their dear Lord, and Blessed Redeemer himself had formerly, and in such a solemn Manner enjoyn'd them to observe, than that which *John the Baptist* used?

But since therefore it cannot be proved, that they used these Words which Christ their Lord and Master, with his own Mouth delivered, but the very Form that *John* used; it is surely most consistent to believe, that they when they baptized with Water, performed it, not by Virtue of Christ's Command, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* whose Words they did not use, but in Honour to *John's* Baptism, whose Form they did use.

3dly, That it is not Christian Baptism, unless it be administered in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, hear what *Dr. Willet* on Behalf of the Protestants, or Church of England, asserts; and what the *Common-Prayer Book*; and also our Author himself holds, concerning the Form of Baptism, (*says the Dr.*)
 “ We all agree, that no other Form is to be
 “ used than that prescrib'd by our Saviour
 “ Christ; to baptize in the Name of the Fa-
 “ ther, Son, and Holy Ghost; that it is nei-
 “ ther lawful to change the Form in Sense, as
 “ many

“ many *Hereticks* have done ; nor yet in
 “ Words, to leave out any of the Three
 “ Persons in the *Trinity*, and inclusively to
 “ understand them by naming of One.” *Syn-*
nop. Papismi. p. 562.

Ibid. “ How can they be baptized in the
 “ Name of the *Trinity*, unless the *Trinity* be
 “ spoken and named ? p. 563.

The *Common-Prayer-Book* too, towards the
 Conclusion of what relates to Private Baptism,
 signifies, “ That the Form, in the *Name of*
 “ *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are essen-
 “ al Parts of Baptism.”

“ The Christian Baptism alone (*says this*
 “ *Author*) is administred in the *Name of the*
 “ *Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*.
 “ This is the Form of the Christian Baptism,
 “ and which distinguishes it from all other
 “ BAPTISMS whatever.”

“ It being essential to Christian Baptism,
 “ (*says Dr. Burkitt on Acts xix.*) to baptize
 “ in the *Name of the Father, and of the Son,*
 “ *and of the Holy Ghost.*”

Hence it evidently follows, that what the
 Apostles practised of Water-Baptism, as men-
 tion'd in those Places of their Acts, was not
 Christian Baptism, or performed in pursuance
 of *Mat. xxviii. 19.* Since the same was not ad-
 ministr'd

ministred in the Name of the *Trinity*, or according to the Form of Words there express'd, but in the *Name of the Lord*, or *Lord Jesus* only, as *John* did, or according to his Baptism.

“ 'Tis not lawful to leave out ANY of the
 “ Three Persons, (*says Dr. Willett* :) These are
 “ essential Parts of Baptism, saith the Com-
 “ mon-Prayer-Book: They are essential to
 “ Christian Baptism, asserts *Dr. Burkitt*:
 “ This is the Form of the Christian Baptism,
 “ and which distinguishes it from ALL other
 “ Baptisms whatever, *says this Son of the*
 “ *Church*.” Then consequently from what
 the Apostles used, *say I*, what Authority
 hath he, or any else, I pray, to urge that up-
 on us, which they themselves, neither think
 safe to imitate, or allow to be Christian?

Sed quid moror istis? The Author tells us
 plainly, that *John's* Baptism is * abolished;
 and that Baptism which the Apostles used, be-
 ing the same, is abolished also.

His Observation p. 28. *That Water-Baptism*
did not cease with John, but was continued after

* *Dr. Willett* in Opposition to the *Papists*, maintain-
 ing that *John's* Baptism differed from what the Apo-
 stles used, asserts, “ That the Apostles were baptized
 “ with none other than *John's*;” And brings many
 Arguments to prove, that *John's* Baptism, and what
 the Apostles administred, were the same. *Synop. Papist.*
 p. 584, 585, 6. See also *Dr. Burkitt* on *Acts* xix. 3, 4.

his Death, is but meer Trifling, and has not the least Appearance of Argument in't, as any way to infer, that the Baptism which was used after *John's* Decease, as that mention'd in the *Acts*, must of Necessity have been different to *John's*.

One may as rationally plead, that the outward Circumcision and other *Jewish* Rites, which were practised after the Abrogation of the Law at the Death of Christ, were not the same with those enjoyn'd in the *Mosaic* Dispensation. Though it be undeniably true, that the Legal Ceremonies were * abrogated and abolished, at and by the Death of Christ; yet 'tis certain they were practised many Years after, even by the Apostles themselves: It was not determined whether the *Gentile* Converts should be circumcised, till the Apostolical Synod, *Acts* xv. which by *Dr. Fulk's* Account, was about Twenty Years after Christ's Ascension. And after the Establishment of that Apostolic Decree, *Paul* circumcised *Timothy*, *Acts* xvi. 3. Many Thousands of the *Jewish* Brethren were zealous for the Law: And the Christian Elders advised *Paul* to the Performance of several *Jewish* Rites, as *Purification*, *Offerings*, &c. to which he complied, *Acts* xxi. 21, to 27. The *Eastern* Christians

F 3

use

* *Gal.* iii. 13. *Eph.* ii. 25. *Col.* ii. 14.

use Circumcision still, *Breerwood's Enquiries*,
p. 153. *P. Martyr Locor. Comm. Classis Ate.*
*Cap. 7.**

But as the Continuation of Circumcision,
and other Legal Rites, after the Abrogation
of the *Mosaic System*, at which Time they

* *Dr. Hammond* in his *Annot. on Mat. xix. 28.* main-
tains, " that the State of the Church under Christ, or
" his Spiritual Kingdom, began at his Resurrection
" — That the *Gentiles* were then received into the
" Church, the *Jewish Priesthood* abolished."

Archbishop Williams, in his Book called *The Principles*
of the Christian Religion, p. 104. says, " That Christ
upon the first Day of the Week rose from the Dead, and
" thereby put an End to the *Jewish Dispensation*."

Dr. Prideaux Dean of Norwich, in his *Connexion*
of the Old and New Testament, Vol. 1. p. 263. says, " At
" the Death of Christ, the *Jewish Church*, and the
" *Jewish Worship* at *Jerusalem* were wholly abolished
" and the Christian Church, and the Christian Wor-
" ship succeeded in their Stead; then the Time which
" was determined upon the *Jews*, of their being God's
" peculiar People, and upon *Jerusalem* for its being the
" holy City, being fully expired, thenceforth began
" the Kingdom of the Messiah, and instead of the *Jews*,
" all the Nations of the World were called thereunto,
" and instead of *Jerusalem*, every Place through the
" whole Earth, where God should be worshipped in Spi-
" rit and in Truth, was made holy unto him."

Daniel King an *Anabaptist Preacher*, in his Book cal-
led *The Way to Sion sought out*, which Book was approved
by four of his leading Brethren, viz. *Thomas Patient*,
John Spilsbery, *William Kiffen*, and *John Pearson*, p. 9
says positively, " The New Covenant spoken of

lost their obligatory Force, is not any Argument for the Necessity thereof, or that the same were not included in the general Repeal of the Ceremonial Law.

No more is the Noncessation of the Practice of Water-Baptism, at the Time referred to by *John*, when saying, *I must decrease*, &c. any Argument, that what he then spoke, was not comprehensive of Water-Baptism in general. The Author allows it related to the Abolition of *John's* Baptism, and affirms

F 4

that

“ *Heb. viii.* took Place at the very Death of Christ,

“ *Heb. viii. 4, 5.*

Ibid. p. 11. “ I thus argue, *says he*, either this Covenant is in Force to us *Gentiles*, or else Christ must shed his Blood again, at the Time when it taketh Place; or else It must be confirmed by some other Blood; for a Testament taketh Place at the Death of the Testator. *Heb. ix. 17.*

Ibid. p. 18. “ As I said before, *says he*, If Christ be the Testator and Mediator of this Covenant, and his Blood be the Blood of this Covenant, it must needs take Place at his Death.”

From these Authorities, two Things are fairly inferrible, as by them clearly maintain'd, *First*, That the Legal Dispensation was in Force, and not abolished till the Death of Christ.

Secondly, That the Gospel Dispensation did not commence before that Time, so that *John's* Baptism was under the Legal Dispensation.

Origines scribit, Christum a Johanne non eo baptizatum esse quod in Christo est, sed eo, quod in Lege est. Idem ait, quod baptisma Johannis expletio erat veteris, non Inchoatio novi Baptismi. *Just. Martyr. Ques. & Respon 161.*

that the same is abolished; then most evidently to the whole Dispensation of Water-Baptism, especially since it is so plainly ascribed to *John's*, as peculiar to his Ministration in several Places of Scripture, viz. *Mat. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. John i. 26, 31, 33. Acts xi. 16.* and in that most memorable Passage in *Acts i. 5.* which are some of the last Words which our Blessed Saviour spake to his Apostles, before his Ascension, *For John truly baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, &c.*

Forasmuch then, as upon an impartial Examination, it obviously appears, not only consistent with Holy Writ, but also correspondent to the express Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as laid down by sundry of her Apologetical Theologists, and other Protestant Writers, *That the Water-Baptism which the Apostles used, was no other than that of John the Baptist.* And that it is too apparent to be denied, by this Author's direct Assertion, which we allow to be Orthodox and agreeable to the Scripture, *That the Baptism of John is abolished;* it therefore naturally follows, as a most undeniable Consequence from these Premises, *That that Baptism which the Apostles used, is abolished likewise.*

Wherefore, upon the whole, I doubt not, but it will be plain to every unprejudiced Reader, that this Author, by his so strongly maintaining

maintaining the Abolition of *John's* Baptism has quite done the Business of Water-Baptism for ever, and laid his own Structure as prostrate, as ever the Image of *Dagon* lay before the Ark of God.

Pag. 17. Our Author presents us with the following Argument, *viz.* " The Apostles did practise that Baptism which Christ commanded, *Mat. xxviii.*

" But the Apostles did practise Water-Baptism ;

" Therefore Water-Baptism was that Baptism which Christ commanded, *Mat. xxviii.*

Reply, That the Apostles did administer that Baptism which Christ commanded *Mat. xxviii.* we freely confess. But that the Water-Baptism which they sometimes used and practised, was that Baptism which Christ commanded *Mat. xxviii.* is denied for Reason given.

Christ undoubtedly commanded his Apostles to baptize with his own Baptism ; but to affirm, That that was with Water, is in direct Opposition to these express Texts, *Mat. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 33. Acts i. 5.* which declare it to be with the *Holy Ghost and Fire.*

That

That the Apostles, &c. did baptize with the *Holy Ghost*, and that in an extraordinary Manner too, is easily proved, from the following Portions of Holy Scripture, *Acts* viii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.—ix. 17.—x. 44, 46.—xi. 14, 15, 15.—xix. 5, 6.

Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. informs us, That *Peter* and *John* prayed for the *Samaritan* Converts, that they might receive the *Holy Ghost*. That they laid their Hands on them, and they received the *Holy Ghost*. That through laying on of the Apostles Hands, the *Holy Ghost* was given.

Acts ix. 17: Sets forth, That the Lord *Jesus* sent *Ananias* to *Saul*, that he might receive his Sight, and be filled with the *Holy Ghost*.

It is manifest from *Acts* x. 44.—xi. 14, 15, 16. That it was by the Ministry of the Apostle *Peter*, that *Cornelius* and his Company received the *Holy Ghost*; the Text is express, *that he was to tell them Words whereby they were to be saved*: And that while he told the Words, or preached the Word to 'em, the *Holy Ghost* fell on them. *Augustine*, as before cited, clearly attributes their Reception of the *Holy Ghost* to *Peter's* Ministry. “ *Cornelius*,
“ *says he*, hearing and believing that which
“ *Peter* preached, was so CLEANSED, that
“ before visible Baptism, he with his, that
“ were

“ were present, received the Gift of the Holy Ghost.”

It is obvious enough from *Acts* xix. 5, 6. That the *Epbesian* Disciples received the Gift of the *Holy Ghost* through the Ministry of the Apostle *Paul*. The Contents of the Chapter in the *English Bible* printed by the King's Authority, has these Words, viz. *The Holy Ghost is given by Paul's Hands*. * *Clarius* on the *Criticks*, on *Acts*. viii. 15. says, “ It seems therefore to have been the peculiar Office of the Apostles, to give the *Holy Ghost*.”

Dr. *Hammond's Annot.* on *Acts* viii. 17. says, “ The *Holy Ghost* by them (*i. e.* the Apostles) Ministry coming on all the sincere Believers, and endowing them with inward, and some of them with Extraordinary External Gifts, of *Healing, Prophecy, &c.*”

Dr. *Burkit* on *Acts* xix. 17. “ *Ananias* (says he) though no Apostle, no Deacon, nor Minister, that we read of, but an ordinary and private Christian only, yet he has Power to heal *Saul* of his Blindness, and to confer the Holy Ghost; *Receive thy Sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost.*—The Apostles, (says he) had Power to confer the “ Holy

* Videtur ergo fuisse peculiare Apostolorum munus dare Spiritum sanctum.

“ Holy Ghost. On Acts viii. 17. he writes,
 “ The Gifts of Tongues and Prophecy, and a
 “ Power to work Miracles : These were now
 “ conferred on such Persons whom the Holy
 “ Ghost directed them to lay their Hands
 “ upon.”

Dr. Hammond on Acts ix. 17. thus paraphrases, “ And Ananias went to him, (i. e. Saul) and laying his Hands on him, told him, that Jesus (that had appeared as he came to Damascus) had sent him to him, not only to restore his Sight to him, but to endow him with many Extraordinary Gifts and Graces, thereby to fit him for God's Service in the Church.”

Thus I think it is sufficiently evident, that the Apostles, &c. were the Instrumental Means of conferring these Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit, through the Assistance and Co-operation of Christ as the Principal and Immediate Efficient Cause.

And that these Gifts so conferred upon those Parties, were the Extraordinary Gifts or Effusions of the Holy Ghost, I presume none will deny ; the Text is express relating to Cornelius and his Friends, Acts x. 46. And likewise to the Ephesians, Acts xix. 6. They spake with Tongues and prophesied : That that which the Samaritans received by the Ministry of Peter and John, and also what Ananias conferred

on *Saul*, was the Extraordinary Gift, or Effusion of the Spirit. *Dr. Hammond* and *Burkit*, maintain it as above cited.

And that to be INDUED with these Extraordinary Gifts, is to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, our * *Norfolk* Author himself repeatedly

* Our Author in his *Reply to Edmund Peckover*, p. 11. says, "They (i. e. the *Apostles*) might preach and convince Men, and be instrumental in qualifying them to receive the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; but to say, they gave or baptized with the Holy Ghost, is little better than Blasphemy."

If it is little better than Blasphemy, to say the *Apostles* gave the Holy Ghost, then it is very conspicuously apparent, that not only the Evangelist *Luke*, but also the Annotators on the Bible printed by the King's Authority, *Clavius*, *Dr. Hammond* and *Burkit* too, are notoriously guilty thereof. The holy Evangelist says, *The Holy Ghost was given through the laying on of the Apostle's Hands*, *Acts viii. 18*. The Annotators on the Bible say, "the Holy Ghost given by *Paul's Hands*." *Clavius*, "that it seems to have been the peculiar Office of the *Apostles* to give the Holy Ghost." *Dr. Hammond*, "that *Ananias* was sent to *Saul*, to endow him with many Extraordinary Gifts, &c. On *Acts i. 5*. he holds, that not only the *Apostles*, but their Successors, gave the Holy Ghost to Believers." *Dr. Burkit* on *Acts ix. 17*. says plainly, "the *Apostles* had Power to confer the Holy Ghost, and conferring is synonymous with Giving." *Monstrum horrendum, &c. O tempora, O! Mores*. What shall we say for a Man's Integrity, that makes no Scruple to bring, not only the holy Evangelist, and several Theological Writers, but also two eminent Doctors of his own Church, under the Imputation of Blasphemy! What sort of *Divines* have these

peatedly confesses, as aforecited, under the 2d *Proposition*; and the Words of *Peter*, * *Acts* xi. 16. confirm, that it was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost which produced those Extraordinary Effects.

Whence

these been, who assisted in, or at least approv'd of the Author's notable Productions! If himself was no more considerate than to talk at random, one would think they should have had more Wit than to have suffered much less to have encouraged him thus egregiously to rebel. To speak my humble Opinion, I must confess, I see but very little Reason, from the whole Scene of the Discourse, to believe, that they who were concerned therein, were Men of the greatest Profundity and Penetration, that ever appear'd in the World; nor yet of the largest Size of Thinking of those that now exist. If the Apostles, who were so extraordinarily replenished with the Holy Ghost themselves, never gave or communicated thereof to others, we need not in the least question, but that our Author will readily assent, that the Divines of the Church of *England*, who never make Pretence to any other, than a vast Inferiority of Spiritual Endowments in Comparison of the Apostles, are far from pretending, that they ever gave, or can give or administer of the Holy Ghost to their Hearers. And if so, as I very much fear 'tis so in reality, (for we may suppose the Author speaks as much from Experience as Speculation in the Case) then methinks, it is high Time for the People to consider upon what Account, and with what View they bestow such large Portions of their Temporals on the Clergy; but perhaps more of this in Answer to his Third Question.

* Then remembered I the Word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with Water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.

Whence it is a necessary Conclusion (even according to our Author's own Terms) That these divinely inspired Men, viz. *Peter, John, Ananias and Paul*, did instrumentally baptize with the Holy Ghost, through the Concurrence of Christ as the efficient Cause ; even as 'tis said, *They raised the Dead, healed the Sick, &c.* For it is most apparent, that the Apostles, &c. were as much the instrumental Means of baptizing those Parties with the Holy Ghost, as they and others were, of *raising the Dead, healing the Sick, &c.* as for Instance see *Acts* xx. 9, 10. xxviii. 3, 9. and 2 *Kings* iv. 32, to 35. and observe if their Proceedings there, especially the Prophets, were not parallel, or very agreeable to that of the Apostles, *Acts* viii. 14, to 18. and what Action can be more fully and plainly attributed to any Person, than that is to the Prophet? viz. *This is the Woman, and this is her Son, whom Elisha restored to Life*, 2 *Kings* viii. 5. Thus we see how expressly the Effect is ascribed to the instrumental Cause or Means only ; and many such like Instances do occur in Scripture ; Christ very plainly ascribed the Effect to the instrumental Means, when he commanded his Apostles to *heal the Sick, raise the Dead, cast out Devils, &c.* *Mat.* x. They could no more raise the Dead than baptize with the Holy Ghost ; being Men, considered meerly as Men, it was wholly out of their Power to restore or convey the least Degree of Life to any, without the immediate Assistance of Christ

as

as the Principal and Efficient Cause ; and yet our Lord as directly and positively commanded them the Performance thereof, as if the same had been within the Compass of their Natural Abilities. *Heal the Sick, (says he) cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils, &c.* But to inform us, that the Power of Action, efficiently considered, was intire from Christ, the Text says, *He gave them Power over unclean Spirits, to heal all manner of Diseases, &c.* Wherefore it is plain, that tho' Christ commanded them to perform such and such miraculous Actions, as if the Accomplishment thereof had been within the Reach of their Natural Capacities, abstractly considered from Supernatural Co-operation; yet were they no more than Instruments in the Administration, as actuated by an Omnipotent Being. The very same is to be understood concerning *Mat. xxviii. 19.* where our Lord commanded them to *disciple all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* notwithstanding they were no more of Ability to perform this, than that in *Mat. x.* destitute of Spiritual Assistance; for as it is apparent from the Text, *Mat. x.* that he sent them not forth without enduing them with Authority and Power for the Execution of his Command ; so in *Mat. xxviii.* though he bid them go, &c. yet prior thereto he informed 'em of his Omnipotency that should attend them in the Execution of his Injunction. *Data est mihi omnis potestas in Cælo & in Terrâ. Et sicut me misit Pater meus, etiam Ego*

Ego mitto Vos, as Tremellius renders it from the Syriac. *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth: And as my Father sent me, so send I you, Go ye therefore, &c.* And in Luke xxiv: 49. *Tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye be indued with Power from on high.* In Acts. i. 8. *Ye shall receive Power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be Witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost Parts of the Earth.* Thus 'tis clearly manifest, that the Apostles had full Information of the Concurrence and immediate Influence of the Divine Power that should accompany them in the Discharge of their Office; qualifying them for that great and important Business, viz. *to disciple all Nations, baptizing them.* So that there is plainly set forth both the principal, efficient Cause, and the instrumental.

The Paraphrase of that excellent Author Thomas Ellwood, on Mat. xxviii. 19. very much deserves an Insertion here. “ See here, “ *says he*, a golden Chain of many Links depending one upon another.

“ 1st, The Ground of this Commission from Christ to them, was the Fulness of Power given unto him. *All Power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth, go ye therefore and teach.*

G

“ 2.

“ 2. Yet were they not to go upon this
 “ Service, about this so important Business
 “ until they were thoroughly furnished with
 “ Power effectual, to carry on the Work
 “ they were sent to do; *But tarry ye until ye*
 “ *be indued with Power from on high!*

“ 3. When thus indued with Power from
 “ on high, they were to go forth in the Pow-
 “ er, and therein, and thereby, to teach
 “ powerfully, as by their Teaching to bap-
 “ tize those they taught; *Go ye therefore teach*
 “ *all Nations, baptizing.*

“ 4. So that the Baptizing was the genuine
 “ and proper Effect of the Teaching, for
 “ indeed that Teaching was not a verbal
 “ Preaching to the Hearers Ear only, but
 “ was a Speaking to their Hearts, and be-
 “ getting in them a true and living Faith;
 “ was a discipling them, or making Disciples
 “ of them.

“ 5. Though Baptizing was into the Name
 “ of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, a putting
 “ them under, and in Subjection to the Name,
 “ that is, the Divine Power, Life and Virtue
 “ of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

“ 6. They who were thus by their powerful
 “ Preaching discipled, and thereby baptized
 “ into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy
 “ Ghost, should be saved; but they that be-

“ lieved

lieved not should be damned, because without this Baptism they could not be saved, and without believing they could not be thus baptized." So far *Ellwood*.

Nor is it at all against Reason, that the Apostles, who were filled with the Holy Ghost themselves, should communicate or dispense thereof to the well dispos'd Recipients or obedient Hearers; *Such as I have, give I unto thee,* with *Peter* to the impotent Man, *Acts* iii. 6. In which Passage observe two Things, 1st, that *Peter* very plainly attributeth the Effect to the Instrumental Means, *Such as I have, give I unto thee.*

2dly, Though in this Expression he ascribes the Effect to the Instrumental Cause, yet in the very next Words he clearly distinguishes the principal efficient Cause, *In the Name of Jesus of Nazareth, (says he) rise up and walk.*

From all which, I think, it may be safely affirmed, that it is as consistent with Scripture, Reason, and the Nature of Things, to say, that the Apostles baptized with the Holy Ghost, as to say, that they *raised the Dead, healed the Sick, cleansed the Lepers, &c.* And if the Author is of a contrary Opinion, as he appears to be, 'tis his Province, clearly to demonstrate why they were not as well the instrumental Means of the One as the Other. And that which the more closely enjoyns him or

his Adherents, the Performance hereof, is that he asserts the Last, but denies the First.

Pag. 13. of his *Letter*, he says, “ The Apostles and Primitive Christians were enabled to raise the Dead, speak with Tongues, heal the Sick, and do Miracles.” — Pag. 11. of his *Reply to E. P.* he says, “ It is little better than Blasphemy to say, they gave or baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Let him therefore give in his next, a sufficient or convincing Reason, why he holds such a Contrariety of Judgment in two Cases so parallel and of equal Verity ; as plainly shewing from Scripture, Reason, and the Nature of Things, why the Instrumentality of the One, is not as predicable of Men as the Other.

Having fairly proved, that the Apostles baptized with the Holy Ghost, in a powerful and extraordinary Manner, we shall touch a little concerning it, in a more common and ordinary Way, which as it were, naturally follows, as an Argument *a majori* ; for seeing it is very obvious, and undeniably true, that they were qualified and impowered to baptize with, or dispense of, the Spirit in an extraordinary Degree, even to the producing of Wonders and Miracles, there is not the least Room for Doubt or Hesitation, but that they had Power, and were enabled to confer the Baptism of the Spirit in what is called a more common and ordinary Way ; or that Measure of the Spirit wherewith

wherewith every true Believer is reach'd, melt-
ed, sanctified, and begotten anew to God in
Christ; by which every Christian is baptized
into one Body, according to the Apostle, *1*
Cor. xii. 13. the which is chiefly pointed at in
John the Baptist's Declaration, contain'd
in these following Texts, *Mat.* iii. 11. *Mark*
8. *Luke* iii. 16, 17. *John* i. 33. (as has been
shewn in Reply to the second *Proposition*) And
whereunto the Commission, *Mat.* xxviii. 19.
principally relates; for we may reasonably
conclude, that the Number of those, to whom
the Apostles, &c. were made instrumental to
confer of the Spirit, in an extraordinary De-
gree, was very small, in consideration of
those vast Numbers whom they converted,
and unto whom they were made instrumental
to bestow, or confer of the Spirit in a more
ordinary Manner. The Commission of *Paul*
is recorded, *Acts* xxvi. 17, 18. *Delivering thee*
from the People, and from the Gentiles, to whom
I now send thee, to open their Eyes, and to turn
them from Darkness to Light, and from the Pow-
er of Satan unto God, that they may receive For-
giveness of Sins, and Inheritance among them that
are sanctified, &c. is a clear Testification here-
of. The Administration allotted *Paul* in his
Commission, though it seems in a Manner mi-
raculous, (and indeed as *Dr. Burkit* says on
Acts iii. 11. "Justifying Faith has a Mira-
cle in it—requiring the same Power to
work in us, which raised Christ up from
the Dead, *Eph.* i. 11.") yet was it even such

as is necessary for every true Christian to experience.

“ The Apostle, who was only the Instrument, (*says Burkit*) is said to open the Eyes of the Blind, and to turn Sinners from Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God; all which is properly and principally the Work of the Spirit of Christ; yet (*says he*) he pleased to put this Honour upon his Instruments the Ministers, by **WHOM HE WORKETH ALL THIS.**” Whence two Things are remarkable; 1st, That the Apostle was the instrumental Means, whereby those he converted attained to the Degrees of Advancement in Regeneration, as mentioned in the Commission, viz. *of opening the Eyes of the Mind, of turning 'em from Darkness to Light &c.* 2dly, Though he was but the Instrument thereof, yet the Effect is ascribed to him: And let it be farther observed, That if the Apostle was impowered to open the Eyes of the Understanding, to turn 'em from Darkness to Light, and from Satan's Power to God, it cannot be denied, but that he administered thereby, such a Measure or Portion of the Spirit, which they receiving by Faith, washed and cleansed the Heart, purified the Conscience from Sin, &c. for without this, 'tis in vain to pretend that any could be changed from a corrupt, polluted and unclean Vessel of Satan, to a sanctified Temple of God, for the Holy Ghost to reside in.

2dly,

2dly, That such a Measure or Communi-
cation of the Spirit, as washes and cleanseth
the Soul from Sin, and spiritual Uncleanness,
and Corruption, is, and may properly be de-
nominated, *the Baptism of the Spirit*, is plain,
not only from the Sense of the Word *Baptizo*,
see *Leigh* his *Critica Sacra*. The Scripture
at *τολλοις βαπτισμοις*, and *divers Washings*, Heb.
ix. 10. and from our Author himself, who
makes Baptism and Washing synonymous, p.
8, 9, 24. So does * *Archbishop Williams*; but
also from the concurring Testimonies of ma-
ny approved *Theological Writers* upon *Mat.*
iii. 11. expounding the Baptism of the Spirit,
to be that which renews the Heart, cleanses
from Sin, purges the Conscience, &c. See
the Reply to the second *Proposition*. And Dr.
Burkit on 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. makes the *Answer of*
a good Conscience, the singular Effect of the
Spirit's Baptism only.

If corporeal Washing and Baptism, be syno-
nimous, according to our Author himself,
Arch-bp. *Williams*, &c. Then so may spiritual
Washing and Baptism be synonymous likewise,
thus I think it is very plain and demonstrable,
that the Baptism of the Spirit was within *Paul's*
Commission. And to come to Matter of
Fact, or what he performed in Consequence
G 4 hereof,

* *Archbishop Williams*, in his Book called, *The Prin-
ciples of the Christian Religion*, &c. p. 143.

hereof, himself says, 1 Cor. iv. 15. *For tho' ye have Ten Thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many Fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you thro' the Gospel.* From which I argue, that if he had begotten them thro' the Gospel (*which is the Power of God unto Salvation*, as the Apostle himself defines it, Rom. i. 16.) then certainly he must have instrumentally administered the Spiritual Baptism, or the Washing and sanctifying Grace of the Spirit, or Holy Ghost, whereby they were so begotten, and without which, such a State or Attainment could not be produced: This is so self-evident, that it scarce needs any further Illustration, yet for Corroboration of the Assertion, take the following Text, 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2. *Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? Are not you my Work in the Lord? — For the Seal of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.* 2 Cor. xi. 2. *For I have espoused you to one Husband, that I may present you as a chaste Virgin to Christ,* Rom. i. 11. *For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual Gift, to the End you may be established.* Gal. iii. 2, 5. *This one Thing would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the Hearing of Faith? He therefore that ministreth to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you, doth he it by the Works of the Law, or, by the Hearing of Faith?*

Observe the Coherence between the Commission and the Actions perform'd in pursuance thereof. The Commission bids open their Eyes, turn them from Darkness to Light, from

from the Power of Satan to God. Pursuant hereto, he tells the *Corinthians*, that he had begotten 'em in *Christ* through the *Gospel*, which fully implies, both an Administration of Spiritual Sight, and a turning 'em from Darkness to Light, and from Satan to God. He farther tells them, *they were his Work in the Lord*, &c. what can be plainer? —In his 2d Epistle to 'em, he told 'em directly, *that he espoused them to one Husband*, *that he might present 'em a chaste Virgin to Christ*; this is a clear Testimony, that he instrumentally, through the Assistance of Christ, baptized them with the Spirit, conferr'd of the Holy Ghost to such a Degree, as washed, purified, and translated 'em from polluted Subjects of Satan, to sanctified Members of Christ.

He acquaints the Believers at *Rome*, of his earnest Desire of an Opportunity to impart *Donum Spiritus*, the Gift of the Spirit, as the *Syriac* has it.

He lets the *Galatians* know, *that they received the Spirit by hearing Faith preached*; which is as much as to say, the Preacher conferr'd the Spirit upon 'em; nay he farther tells 'em plainly, that the Preacher ministred the Spirit to them, *He that ministreth to you the Spirit* (says he) *and worketh Miracles among you*, &c.

4. That the same Measure or Communication of the Spirit, which they did so convey, and

and which wrought, or produc'd, such a powerful and astonishing a Change in the Mind of those that heard 'em, was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, is undeniable.

1st, From the Effect produc'd, 'twas such as purified and cleansed from all Corruption, &c.

2dly, It was no less powerful and astonishing in Operation, than what the Apostles themselves received, which was the Baptism of the Spirit, even according to our Opponent's own Definition: They all allow the Apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost.

Thus in my Opinion it appears very plain, that the Apostles did instrumentally baptize with the Holy Ghost; gave or convey'd by their Preaching and Teaching, such a Measure or Manifestation of the Holy Spirit, as wrought a wonderful and amazing Change in the Minds of their Hearers, washing, purifying and cleansing their Hearts from sinful Delements.

So that when this * Author tells the World, that it is little better than Blasphemy, to say the Apostles gave or baptized with the Holy Ghost, he does not only oppose and censure

us

us, the People call'd *Quakers*, but (not to name the Holy Scripture) also the approved *Doctors* of his own Society.

Now, courteous Reader, if thou impartially weighest what has been offer'd, I do not doubt but thou wilt be fully satisfied, that the Apostles did by Virtue of the Commission, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* through the Concurrence of Christ, baptize with the Holy Ghost, but in an Ordinary and Extraordinary Manner.

The same Argument therefore, which our Author would inforce in Favour of Water-Baptism, doth with a small Variation, turn directly against him, and prove it to be the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, after this manner,

The Apostles did administer, or baptize with that Baptism which Christ commanded, *Mat. xxviii.*

But the Apostles did administer, or baptize with the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Therefore the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, was that Baptism which Christ commanded *Mat. xxviii.*

Pag. 21. " St. Paul tells us, that Christ
 " loved his Church, and delivered himself for it,
 " that he might sanctifie it, purging it with the
 " Washing of Water, *Eph. v. 26.* meaning
 " that

“ that Baptism intitles us to the Graces of the
 “ Spirit, to purge away the Guilt and De-
 “ filement of Sin, without which they both
 “ lie upon us, and leave us in the Gall of Bit-
 “ terness, and in the Bond of Iniquity, and such
 “ (saith he to the Corinthians) were some of you,
 “ till ye were washed (in the Water of Bap-
 “ tism) justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus,
 “ and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor.
 “ vi. 11. which great Blessings of Justificati-
 “ on and Sanctification, are first and chiefly
 “ derived on us in our Baptism.” *

Reply, From the Apostle's mentioning the
 Washing of Water, he, like the poor igno-
 rant Samaritan Woman, immediately de-
 scends to material Water. And though he
 would have it to mean Water-Baptism, yet he
 acknowledges it is the Grace of the Spirit that
 purges away the Guilt and Defilement of Sin.
 But then Elementary Water must be *Medium*
conferendi, that which conveys the sanctifying
 Grace of the Spirit. “ The working of Wa-
 “ ter upon the outward, (says he p. 20.) gives
 “ us a Title, and is the Means of conveying
 “ the

* Christ never gave it, (i. e. Water-Baptism) to his
 “ Disciples in their first Commission to preach to the
 “ Jews, Mat. x. nor baptized he any himself, that can
 “ be found; nor doth it appear, that this in Mat. xxviii.
 “ is meant of baptizing with Water, but by the Spirit,
 “ which Christ baptized with in their Administration,
 “ saying, Lo I am with you, or in you, &c. John Salt-
 nath, Some Beams, &c. p. 245.

“ the Sanctification of the Spirit in the inward
“ Man.”

So it seems, Elementary Water being applied to our Bodies, conveys the sanctifying Power of the Holy Ghost to our Souls.— But how this can be, appears to me as irreconcilable, both with Scripture, Sense and Reason, as the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and he that can acquiesce with the first, has little or no Cause to declaim against the last. Dr. Willet personating the *Protestants*, says expressly, “ The Sacraments have no Power to “ give or confer GRACE to the Receiver.” *Synop. Papif.* p. 541.

But the Text it self plainly enough shews, what Water is there intended, had not this Author, viz. *Phil. Bedingfield*, made a most unnatural Divorce between the Water and the Word, by leaving the latter quite out of his Book, tho’ the same is the last and most material Word in the Verse, which clearly demonstrates to whether of the two he gives the Preference, and was most intent upon. The Apostle says, *purging it with the Washing of Water by (or in) the Word*: But our Author citing the Verse, makes a full Stop at Water, and wholly omits what immediately follows, viz: *by the Word*; which is evidently as great a Perversion and Imposition, as if any *Quaker* in citing the said Text, had intirely left out, *with the washing of Water*; which to have

have committed, would undoubtedly have met with no kinder Reception, than an
 “ * *O tempora! O mores!* What shall I say
 “ for a Man's Integrity, that quotes a Text,
 “ but will not give the Words, knowing they
 “ make against him.” And certain it is, this
 Text *Eph. v. 26.* makes nothing for, but a-
 gainst Water-Baptism, for the Apostle calling
 it the *washing of Water by the Word*, appa-
 rently denotes the Water to be that of the
 Word, or the cleansing, sanctifying Efficacy
 of the Spirit, in concurrence of several other
 Scripture Passages, *Isa. xlv. 3.* For I will
 pour Water upon him that is thirsty, and Floods
 upon the dry Ground, and this (as *Pool* says on
John iii. 5.) is immediately explained, viz.
 “ I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed, and
 “ my Blessing upon thine Offspring, and the
 “ divine Birth follows, they shall spring up
 “ as amongst the Grass. In the same Man-
 “ ner (*saieth he*) the Effects of the Holy Spi-
 “ rit is expressed by *Ezekiel*, I will pour clean
 “ Water upon you, and ye shall be clean. *Ezek.*
 “ xxxvi. 25, 26, 27. and presently after, I
 “ will put my Spirit within you. vide *John iii.*
 “ 5. chap. iv. 10, 13. chap. vii. 37 38 where
 “ the Effects of the Spirit are expressed by
 “ Water.” And in that of *I Cor. vi. 11.*
 what can be plainer? There the Apostle ex-
 pressly ascribes their being washed and sancti-
 fied,

hied, to the Work of the Spirit ; saying, *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.*

Pag. 22. He begins with the Passage in 1 Pet. iii. 21. But what he delivers concerning it, is much to the same Effect, of what has been often alledged by the Assertors of Water-Baptism.

“ It must be Water-Baptism, (*says he*) or you cannot make Sense of the Apostle’s Words, or the Figure alluded to by St. Peter.”

Reply, We object against the Word [Figure] and account the Original *αἰτίωμα* most properly signifies *Antitype* in this Place, and for Confirmation hereof, I offer the Authority of several eminent Expositors.

“ *Vocula αἰτίωμα hoc loco significat ipsam Veritatem, similitudine seu Analogiā quadam Typo & Figura respondentem. i. e.* The Word Antitype in this Place, signifies the very Truth it self, answering by a certain Likeness or Analogy, to the Type or Figure.” *says Gerk on the Place, as cited by Leigh in his Critica Sacra.*

“ *Verbo αἰτίωμα, so Grotius on Heb. ix. 24.* [*αἰτίωμα*] *von est unceps: Nam & de Figura dicitur*

“ *dicitur ut hic: & de re per Figuram significat*
 “ *ta ut* 1 Pet. iii. 21. *i. e.* The Word *Antity-*
 “ *pon* is doubtful; for it is spoken here (in
 “ *Heb. ix. 24.*) of the Figure; but in 1 Pet.
 “ iii. 21. it is spoken of the Thing signified by
 “ the Figure.”

“ The Word *an* in Composition (says
 “ *Gerk*) is used sometimes for that which is in
 “ the Place or Stead of another, (as a Figure
 “ or Type is) sometimes for that which is
 “ contrary or opposite to it (as the Antitype
 “ is to the Type.) When *Peter* (says he)
 “ calls Baptism the Antitype of the Ark, he
 “ does not use the Word *an* in the former
 “ Signification, as if Baptism as a new Type,
 “ had succeeded to that old Type; but he u-
 “ ses it in the latter Signification, that Bap-
 “ tism is opposed to that old Type, as a Thing
 “ that had been shadowed out by it.”*

Vatablus on the Place. “ The Baptism by
 “ which we are saved, is not the Washing by
 “ which the Filths of the Body are washed
 “ off; but the Declaration of an upright and
 “ faithful Mind towards God, by which the
 “ Filths

* *Vocula an* in compositione quandoque usurpatur
 pro eo, quod est vice alterius, quandoque pro eo quod
 est contra. Quando Petrus Baptismum vocat *Arca*
τίπου, non utitur vocula *an* in Significatione prioris,
 quasi Baptismus tanquam novus typus veteri illi succed-
 ferit, sed in Significatione posteriore, quod Baptismus
 veteri illi typo opponatur, tanquam res eodem admi-
 brata. *Gerk* in *Loc. Critica Sacra*.

" Filths of the Soul are washed out, as the
 " Filths of the Body by Water."

Dr. Hammond, a very Learned Man, and famous in the *English Church*, both in his *Paraphrase*, *Marginal Notes*, and *Annotations*, renders the Word *Ἀντίτυπον*, in this Place, *Antitype*. In his *Margin* he says, *The Antitype of which Baptism now &c.* In his *Paraphrase*, *That Baptism, that Antitype to the Ark in Water.* In his *Annotations*, he says, in an old Copy in *Magdalen College in Oxford*; it is clearly *Ἀντίτυπον* the *Antitype of which*.

Cameron on the Place, having observed from *1 Pet. ii. 9.* and *Rev. i. 6.* that we are made *Kings and Priests to God*, says, " We become such by the Inward Baptism, by which we are made Partakers of the Death and Resurrection of Christ. Then adds, Of this Inward Baptism we have certain Types (or Figures) in the Old Testament, and in the first Place, the Water of the Flood and the Ark of Noab." ¶

H

Piscator

Vasab. Baptisma quo nos servamur, non est ablutio quâ abluuntur sordes corporis; sed Declaratio recti & fidelis Animi erga Deum, quâ Sordes Animæ eluuntur, ut Aquâ Sordes corporis.

¶ *Camer.* Tales simus per Baptismum internum, quo simus mortis & Resurrectionis Christi participes. Huius interni Baptismi Typos aliquos habemus in vet. Teste, in primis autem

Piscator on *Mat. iii. 11* concerning this Text, says, " 'Tis not the Outward Baptism, whereby the Filths of the Flesh are put away, that saves, but the Inward Baptism whereby a good Conscience may ask God

" The Baptism of Christ, (says *Salmar*) is that true spiritual Washing and Cleansing wherewith all his are baptized, not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, &c. and this is the Baptism which is said in this Place to save us, *Βαπτισμα ἡμῶν τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, as *Noah's Ark* did those eight Persons in *Figure*." †

The *Syriac* Version, as *Tremellius* turns it is, " *Secundum quem Typum vos quoque salvi facti estis per Baptismum. i. e.* according to which Type ye are also saved by Baptism."

Observe, the *Syriac* does not, any more than the *Greek*, make the Baptism which saves the Type or Figure; but it makes *Noah's* being saved in the Ark from Water, a Type or Figure of the Saving Baptism.

Dr. Burkit on the Place, " Observe here, (says he) the Type and the Antitype, the

" Ark

* *Piscar.* Non externus ille Baptismus, quo carnis Sordes abijciuntur facit; sed Baptismus internus, quo fit ut Conscientia bona interroget Deum.

† Some Beams of that Bright and Morning Star. p. 31, 32.

“Ark and Baptism, their Salvation from the
 “*Deluge* by the Ark, prefigureth our Salva-
 “tion from God’s Wrath by Baptism.” Thus
 he very plainly makes the Ark the Type or
 Figure, and Baptism the Antitype or Thing
 prefigured thereby: And a little lower he
 saith, “Learn hence, that Outward Baptism
 “alone saves none, but the INWARD only
 “and the Sign and singular Effect of INWARD
 “BAPTISM, is the Answer of a good Con-
 “science towards God.”

These Authorities do (in Concurrence with
 us, but in Opposition to our Antagonists) ve-
 ry conspicuously demonstrate two Particulars
 in Relation to this Text.

1st, That the Word *Answer* should be
 render’d ANTITYPE.

2^{dly}, That it is the INWARD BAPTISM only
 which now saves.

And indeed to understand it otherwise, would
 make the Apostle apparently Inconsistent with
 himself; for to apprehend it to mean Figure
 or Water-Baptism, as our Author asserts, it
 represents the Apostle to speak to this Effect,
 The Figure, or Water-Baptism which now saves,
 is not Water-Baptism, but the Baptism of the
 Spirit, or inward Baptism; since he, the A-
 postle, positively denies it to be that whereby
 the Filth of the Flesh is put away, which is

Water-Baptism; but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, which is the singular Effect of the Inward or Spiritual-Baptism.

2dly, It would destroy the Similitude or Analogy; for the Ark in the Waters was properly and homogeneally adapted to the Preservation of the Body, and did actually preserve all that abode therein, from Corporeal Destruction; but so is not Water-Baptism to the saving of the Soul; it being very dissimilar and of a different Nature thereto, has not properly any Power or Efficacy to cleanse or preserve the same from Sin and Death. The Maintainers of Water-Baptism themselves, do freely own that it is not Outward, but Inward or Spiritual Baptism that saves. As to what this Author, viz. P. B. says p. 47. of his *Appendix*, viz. "That as
" Noah and the rest were sav'd in the Ark by
" Water from Corporeal Death, so are the
" true Believers sav'd by the Water of Baptism,
" from the Death of Sin and Hell." 'Tis but a meer Fiction, as not having any Countenance from the Sacred Text; nor is it at all congruous with Reason, or common Sense, and flatly contradictory to many approved Authors; so what he builds upon that Hypothesis falls to the Ground.

But on the contrary, if we take it to mean the Antitype, or the Truth it self, prefigured by the Type according to *Gerh, Vatablus,*
Piscator,

Piscator, Grotius, Cameron, Hammond, &c.
the Passage will be perfectly harmonious
throughout. * *for the Antitype*

1st, There will be an entire Coherence be-
tween the Cause and the Effect, whereby the
Apostle will be clearly consistent with him-
self; for *ἡ Ἀντίτυπος τοῦ ὕδατος ὡς οὗτος Βαπτισμὸς*,
Whose Antitype Baptism now also saves us; has
direct Relation to *συνηδὴν ἡμῶν ἀγαθὴν ἐκπεπνημέ-
νην*, *the Answer of a good Conscience towards*
God, as the proper Effect thereof. And if the
Answer of a good Conscience towards God,
as Dr. *Burkit* affirms, be the singular Effect of
the Inward Baptism; then by a most necessary
Consequence, the *Ἀντίτυπος Βαπτισμὸς*, which pro-
duces that Effect, must be that of the Spirit,
or Inward Baptism. What can be more plain
and rational? ¶

H 3

2dly,

* "It would be very strange, if any one should seri-
ously affirm, that the sprinkling of our Bodies, or the
plunging them in Water, is of equal Virtue with Pu-
rifying our Souls by Repentance, Faith in Christ, and
a sincere Obedience to his holy Law." Dr. *Mitchell's*
Sermon preach'd at Derby, Sept. 20. 1730.

¶ Appendix p. 48. in Answer to *Burley's* Objection
against the Comparison between the Ark and Water-
Baptism, he says, "Comparisons any more than Para-
bles were never supposed to hold in all particulars,
that a wresting Curiosity would torture them with.

But let me tell him, that upon a close Examination
there will not appear any Resemblance or Comparison
between the Ark and Water-Baptism, respecting the
Point in question.

But

2dly, It makes the Comparison intirely hold, and a most apt Similitude between the Type and the Antitype, for as the Ark in the Water, did really and effectually preserve

But what is most shocking, he tells us, *Ibid.* "That the Baptism of the Spirit saves no more every one than Water-Baptism." Here he places the two Baptisms upon a Level, making the one as salutiferous as the other; Water as powerful as the Spirit; the Creature as the Creator.

If this is not little better than Blasphemy, I scarcely know what can be deemed such.——And to make out this Piece of Heterodoxy, he puts forth the following Paradox, "For (*says he*) let a Man have ever so good a Conscience, and abide in it ever so long, he is still a Sinner, and deserves for his Sins Eternal Condemnation."

But how the Baptism of the Spirit (which, as Dr. Burkit says) only saves, and without which, as the *Assembly of Divines*, on *Mat. iii. 11.* hold, none can be saved, should no more save every one than Water-Baptism, which, as the said *Burkit* declares, saves none: Or how a Man can have ever so good a Conscience, or a Conscience made ever so good, by the Power, or as an eminent Effect of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, (for of such a Conscience the Apostle is there speaking, and likewise *Barclay*) and abide in it ever so long, and yet deserve Eternal Condemnation, is indeed very marvellous, and directly repugnant to the plain Text, which makes the Answer, or Confession, of a good Conscience towards God, the Effect of that which saves. And this Author about six Lines lower, to shew how mightily consistent, or rather inconsistent he is with himself, allows the Calling upon Christ with a good Conscience to be a Means of Salvation, saying, "He that submits to the Methods this Saviour, (*i. e.* Christ) has appointed for the obtaining the Benefits of his Merits, shall only call upon him with a good Conscience and be saved."

serve all that abode therein, from Corporeal Death, so doth the Inward or Spiritual Baptism save every true Believer that abides in it, from Spiritual Death.

But besides our Author's insisting upon the Word *Figure*, he has a Contrivance farther to help him out at a Pinch (for a pinching Text is to the Assertors of Water-Baptism) and that is to add two Words to what the Apostle has delivered, to compel him to speak directly contrary to the express Text. Hear what he says, "I would have you (*says he*) take Notice, that the Words *not* and *but* do in Scripture Phrase, frequently signify *not only, but also*." And for Instances to confirm it, he quotes *Gen. xlv. 8. Mark ix. 39. John vi. 27. — xii. 44.* and thence infers, that St. Peter's Meaning is, that the Baptism that now saves us, is *not only* that outward Baptism, or washing with Water, which is a putting away the Filth of the Flesh, *but also* a good Conscience towards God.

Reply, Though in some of these there is no Necessity of the Addition of *only* and *also*, respecting the then present Cases to which they were applied; yet if they were all Elliptic Passages, and could he produce a Thousand such in Scripture, where the Words *only* and *also* are necessarily understood, what would it avail, except he gives a Parallel Case of Water-Baptism? It is clearly expressed *Gen.*

xxxvii. 28. that *Joseph's* Brethren were actually concern'd in his being convey'd into *Egypt*, so that one Text fully explains another, and may sufficiently defend such a Supply of Words in the defective.

But let him shew any Text, that vindicates such an additional Alteration of the Apostle's Words, in the Place before us, as plainly declaring that Water-Baptism doth save, or is really operative in our Salvation; without this, his drawing such an Inference from these Instances he gives, indicates that he, in Support of his darling Notion, is willing to stoop below what one might have expected from one of his Acquirements; for it amounts to no more than to say, *Gen. xlv. 8. Mark ix. 39. John vi. 27. — xii. 44.* are Elliptical, and want the Addition of *only* and *also*, ergo, *1 Pet. iii. 21.* requires the same.

Speſtatum admiſſi. Riſum teneatis Amici! It is so weak and illogical, that almost any Person of common Sense may easily detect it; by the same Liberty or extravagant Way of Reasoning, any positive Precept may be enervated, and its Validity destroy'd.

It is as great a Perversion, to add *only* and *also* to this Text, *1 Pet. iii. 21.* as it would be to add the same to *Rom. ii. 28, 29.* For *he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that Circumciſion which is outward in the Fleſh; but*

he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter. In this, the Apostle Paul doth clearly exclude the Observation of outward Circumcision, and other Jewish Rites, from being any Part of the Gospel, Law, or New Covenant, and establishes Inward Sanctity, and the Circumcision of the Heart, as necessary for Salvation, wholly without the Outward.

So doth the Apostle Peter in that of his, by the like Phrase, plainly distinguish what Baptism is not saving, and consequently not required; and what is saving and necessary to be experienced as essential for Salvation, altogether exclusive of the other, or that with Water, as any way concurring therewith.

These two Passages of these two eminent Apostles, viz. that of Paul 1 Cor. i. 17. and this of Peter, 1 Pet. iii. 21. are so evidently on our Side of the Question, and do so powerfully militate against the Practice of Water-Baptism, that our Opponents have exerted their utmost Device and Stratagem to stem the Current of the plain Texts, to evite the most natural and unconstrained Sense thereof; but all to no more Purpose than beating the Air, unless to proclaim their own Weakness. The Apostles have expressed themselves in Terms so reciprocally corroborating each other, that there is not the least Room for Cavil or Objection. The

The first in declaring, *that Christ sent him not to baptize*, fully imports, that such a Baptism was not saving; for we may safely conclude, that if it had been saving, or conducive to the Salvation of the Soul, the same would have been in *Paul's Commission*.

The second, in *denying that Water-Baptism saves*, obviously manifests, that it was not in his Commission, or that he had not any Command from Christ to administer it; for it would be a Reflection upon our Blessed Saviour's infinite Wisdom, to suppose that he should command his Ministers (whose sole Business was the Salvation of Souls) the perpetual Practice or Observation of what is not saving. Thus they mutually confirm each other's Assertion, to the utter Discouragement, if not Abolition, of the Practice of Water-Baptism.

Pag. 25. Having quoted *Tit. iii. 4, 5* he says, "Which Words plainly set forth not only the Benefit, but Necessity of Water-Baptism, in Order to Regeneration."

Reply, But how, on wherein doth it set forth either the Benefits or Necessity of Water-Baptism? Is it because he says so? He offers no other Authority for it, and 'tis easy to guess the Reasons why. The Apostle says, *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy, he saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration and renewing of*

the Holy Ghost. Tit. iii. 5. Observe, he calls it the *Washing of Regeneration*, which evidently shows it to be that whereby the Soul is cleansed and sanctified, to the Production of the *New Birth*, which outward Water can never do, 'tis irrational to pretend it.

2dly, This Text is clearly correspondent to *John iii. 5.* Here we have, 1st, the *Washing of Regeneration* to parallel *being born of Water*, which must be spiritual, according to the Birth it produces, as has been shewn.

3dly, Here is the *Renewing of the Holy Ghost*, to answer *being born of the Spirit*; and as being born of Water and the Spirit are synonymous, or Expressions importing the same Thing (agreeable to the Testimony of several Learned * Men, as may be seen in the preceding Pages) so likewise the *Washing of Regeneration* and *renewing of the Holy Ghost*, are co-significant or equivalent Terms; the which clearly sets forth both the Benefits and Necessity, (not of Water-Baptism, as P. B. our Author groundlessly imagines, but) of the Baptism of the Spirit, in Order to Regeneration: And the Apostle makes it plainer yet. The two following Verses unanswerably prove it to be the Baptism of the Spirit, *Which* (says the Apostle) *be shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ*

* *Grotius, Calvin, Piscator, Willet, Pool, Henry, &c.*

Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs according to the Hope of Eternal Life. All which plainly ascribes their being washed, justified, and made Heirs of Eternal Life, sanctified Vessels fit for the Kingdom of Heaven, wholly to the Operation of the Holy Ghost, whereof through the Mediation of Jesus Christ, they had plentifully received.

Piscator on Mat. iii. 11: touching this Place says, "The Apostle, by the Laver of Regeneration, doth not mean Baptism; but the very Efficacy or Operation of the Holy Ghost, namely, the Renovation of their Hearts." *

Burkit on the Place, says, "The immediate and efficient Cause of the Communication of the Love of God the Father, procured through the Mediation of Christ the Son, is the Holy Spirit, in the Work of Regeneration."

The next Passage our Author brings from the Epistles, is, Gal. iii. 27. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

Reply,

* *Piscat.* Apostolus per Lavacrum Regenerationis non intelligit Baptismum, sed ipsam Operationem Spiritus sancti; videlicet, Renovationem Cordium.

Reply, The clearest Way to find out what Baptism the Apostle has Relation to here, whether the Baptism of the Spirit, or that of Water, is to consider what he means by that Rhetorical Phrase, *To put on Christ*: *Beza* on *Rom. xiii. 14.* says, “To put on Christ, is, “to possess him so; as to have him in us, and “us in him.” *

Dr. Hammond expounds it thus, “Set your “selves to the Practice of all Christian Purity.

Burkit thereon says, “Set the Doctrine and “Life of Christ continually before you, follow every Instruction, and imitate all the “Parts of his holy Conversation; even as “the Garment is commensurate to the Body. “—May not the Exposition (*saieth he*) imply, “That the Soul of Man since the Fall, is in “a naked State, destitute of those divine “Graces of the Holy Spirit, which were its “Original Clothing in the Day of undefiled “Innocency.”

And *P. Bedingfield* himself, in his *Appendix*, p. 49. says, “It means to be conformable to “the Doctrine and holy Life of Christ.”

Now

* *Indui Christo est in Possessionem Christi mitti, ita ut ille sit in nobis, & nos in illo.*

Now I dare appeal to any of our Antagonists themselves, whether such a Condition or State of Regeneration, can reasonably be expected and attain'd unto, without the Sanctifying Efficacy of the Spiritual Baptism. For to be in Possession of Christ, so as to have him in us, and us in him: To be in the Practice of all Christian Purity: To be conformable to the Holy Life of Christ: To imitate all the Parts of his Holy Conversation, even as the Garment is commensurate to the Body, and have the Soul clothed with the Graces of the Holy Spirit, which were its original Clothing in the Time of undefiled Innocency, doth certainly bespeak a State of real Renovation, as being cleansed, purged and sanctified, from the Defilements and Corruptions of Sin.

And since, according to the Testimonies of many Christian * Writers, it is the Baptism of the Spirit, that cleanses from Sin, purges the Conscience, illuminates the Mind, kindles Spiritual Habits in the Soul, &c. 'tis most plain and self-evident, that the Baptism which the Apostle here mentions, is no other but that of the Holy Ghost. Nothing short thereof, can produce such an Internal Transformation, as to be changed from the Old to the New Man, and become an Imitator, or Fol-
lower

* Dr. Willet, Piscator, Calvin, Peters, Dodd, Burkin, Henry, &c. as has been shewn.

lower of the Blessed Jesus, in Holiness and Purity of Life.

The Author, viz. P. B. p. 50. of his *Appendix*, paraphrasing on this Text, viz. *Gal. iii. 27.* says, "Everyone that is baptized in-
" to Christ's Profession, is perfectly his, and
" has a Claim to all the Privileges of his
" Church, upon their due Obedience to his
" Religion."

Reply, That every one that is baptized into Christ's Profession, (viz. with Water-Baptism) is perfectly his, there needs nothing more perfectly to expose the notorious Fallacy hereof, than the wicked and ungodly Lives of Thousands, who have received that Ceremony.

2dly, We do not in the least doubt, but they who yield due Obedience to Christ's Religion, have a Claim to all the Privileges of his Church. But what's this to the Purpose? The Question is not, whether they who yield due Obedience to Christ's Religion, have a Claim, &c. But whether the Baptism of the Spirit, or Water-Baptism, can claim a fairer Share (to use his own Words) in the Production of a New Creature; or whether our Spiritual Regeneration (in which State only we become obedient to the holy Commands of Christ) be the natural Consequence or general Effect of the first, or the last of these two Baptisms. We affirm the first, and do think we have

have fully proved it ; our Opponent maintains the last, which in my Sentiments, is little short of Blasphemy ; his Words are, “ And as for “ any mystical * Meaning, I will be bold to “ say, that Water-Baptism will claim a FAIRER “ SHARE than the common Notion of the “ Baptism of the SPIRIT.” ¶

Is it not very strange, *Reader*, that our Author and his Accomplices should be so adventurous, as thus to give Water-Baptism the Preference to that of the Spirit, respecting the mystical Meaning of the Text, viz. The Soul's being clothed with that Cœlestial Array, wherewith it was adorned in its primitive Innocency ; when an approved *Doctor* of his own Church declares the same to be the *Graces of the Spirit* ! That he should tell us the Phrase, *to put on Christ*, means, *to be conformable to his Doctrine and holy Life* ; and yet to represent the Washing with Elementary Water more conducive thereto, than the Sanctification of the Spirit, is such a Piece of manifest Heterodoxy and Inconsistence, as is scarce to be met with in Print.

Ibid. pag. 52. He expounds *Rom. vi. 4. We are buried with Christ by Baptism into his Death*, &c. to mean, “ A being covered “ with Water.” But this is full as gross and antievangelical

* In *Gal. iii. 27.* ¶ Pag. 49. of his *Appendix.*

antievangelical, as the other. Bishop Taylor, on the Place, says, "All this is nothing but
 "Crucifixion of the Old Man, a destroying
 "the Body of Sin, that we no longer serve
 "Sin."* And if so, then 'tis easily foreseen
 what naturally follows from our *Norfolk* Au-
 thor's Doctrine, viz. That Water-Baptism
 crucifies the old Man, or Nature of the first
Adam, destroys the Body of Sin, &c. which
 is such a whimsical and absurd Notion, as e-
 ven a *Papist* would be exceedingly asham'd of.

When the Apostle says, *We are buried with
 Christ by Baptism into his Death*, his Meaning
 is very obvious; That as Christ's Humanity
 or Vail of Flesh was crucified and buried, so
 by Baptism, *that is*, through the Regenerating
 Power of the Holy Spirit, (which washes and
 sanctifies the Soul) the Old Man, the Body of
 Sin in us, is crucified, destroyed, and as it
 were, laid in the Grave. Then with Respect
 to our being raised, he proceeding says, *that
 like as Christ was raised from the Dead by the
 Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk
 in Newness of Life*. Which plainly sets forth,
 that as Christ was raised from the Dead by
 the glorious Power of the Father, so is our
 New Man raised to Holiness of Life by the
 same divine Power or Spirit of God.

I

In

* *Liberty of Prophecy*, p. 243.

In short, if all this, according to the Learned Bishop's Assertion, be nothing but Crucifixion of the Old Man, destroying the Body of Sin, &c. then most evidently, the Baptism which produces such an Effect, is nothing else but that of the Spirit. And the very same is to be understood concerning *Col. ii. 12.* where the Apostle expresses himself in Terms equivalent to this of *Rom. vi. 4.*

As to our Author's Paraphrase on these * Texts, what can one call it more properly, than an insignificant empty Cant of Words, without any Coherence respecting the Nature of the Case, as may easily be demonstrated.

Ibid. p. 38. He affirms, " That the one Baptism mentioned in *Eph. iv. 5.* consists of two Parts, viz. *Water* and the *Spirit*, yet these two Parts (*says he*) make one Baptism." †

Reply

* *Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 10. Rom. vi. 4.*

† Our Author p. 37, 38. in his *Appendix*, undertakes to illustrate the Apostle's Meaning by *one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, one, Faith, one Baptism, one God.*—But upon the whole, his Illustration sounds but harsh and uncouth, and plainly enough indicates the Author thereof, to be rather in Pursuit of his own Honour or Interest, than vindicating the Cause of pure and undefiled Religion.

Suppose the *one Body* which the Apostle mentions, be a spiritual Body, (as undoubtedly it is) and made up of many

Reply, But in this he is notoriously inconsistent with himself, who all along in his
I 2 Discourse,

many Members; what can be inferr'd hence to prove that the *one Baptism* consists of two Parts, viz. *Water* and the *Spirit*? The same Apostle plainly tells us, that, *we being many Members are one Body in Christ*, Rom. xii. 5. and also in 1 Cor. xii. 20. but can he, or any of his Assistants, shew us one single Text that says, *Water-Baptism* and the *Baptism of the Spirit* are but *one Baptism*, or any Thing like it? We are well assured it can never be done. And the Deficiency then renders his Comparison ridiculously weak and inconclusive.

But I cannot imagine, what Relation any Part of his Illustration has to *Water* and the *Spirit's* making up but *one Baptism*. Doth he suppose, that there is the same Diversity of Nature and Essence, between the *Spirit* and its several Gifts, as there is between *Water* and the *Spirit*?—Or that there is the same Unity of Essence, Nature, Power, and Operation, betwixt Elementary *Water* and the Holy Ghost, as there is betwixt the Father, Son and *Spirit*? Do not the most rigid Assertors of *Water-Baptism* freely confess, saying, *Gratia Dei non est alligata Sacramentis*?—Most apparently his Illustration, as he calls it, is rather an Obnubilation of the Text; and if closely pursued, would plunge him into divers gross Absurdities.

The *Assembly of Divines at Westminster*, on the Place, maintain, that there is *one Baptism both in Specie & Numero*. How inconsistent then does it look, for our Author to joyn the *Baptism of Water* and the *Baptism of the Spirit*, to make this *one Baptism in Specie*? Unless he could, or would undertake to prove, that *Water* and *Spirit* are but *one in Specie*?

But to let the Reader see, that what our Author advances on this Text, is but old Matter, and has been fully answered and refuted long ago, I shall here insert what

Discourse, makes Water-Baptism and that of the Spirit, two distinct Baptisms, see his *Letter,*

what our Friend *Joseph Pike* has return'd above twenty Years since, to the like Objections.

" Of the *one Faith*, our Author *P. B.* says, there is
 " Faith in God, and Faith in Christ. Many believe in
 " God, who do not believe in Christ. Yet in a Chri-
 " stian they are not two Faiths, but are comprehended
 " and become one Faith, because the one Faith in
 " Christ doth suppose the other, the Belief of a God.
 " It only adds to it and builds upon it; and this makes
 " them no more two Faiths, than building an House a
 " Story higher makes it two Houses."

Ans. " When they can prove (says *J. Pike*) from
 " Scripture, that Outward Baptism with Water, and
 " the Inward Baptism with the Holy Ghost, do make
 " up the one Baptism of Christ, or hold the same Ana-
 " logy and Proportion, as doth the one Faith, with
 " the several Degrees or Parts of it, they do some-
 " thing: But till then this Comparison is nothing to
 " the Purpose, nor does it in the least answer their
 " End; for the one Faith agrees with it self in its Parts,
 " and does not differ in its Essence, and proceeds from
 " the same Fountain, and Giver of it, who is God,
 " *Eph. ii. 8.* And who gives such Degrees and Propor-
 " tions of it to a true Believer, as it best pleases him,
 " necessary both for a Man's own Salvation, and the
 " Benefit of others, *Rom. xii. 6.* And these several
 " Parts or Degrees (as our Opponents confess) are not
 " so many Faiths, but several Parts of the one Faith, and
 " so far we agree: But on the contrary, Water-Bap-
 " tism and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, are two
 " such very different Things in Nature and Kind to one
 " another, that nothing can well be greater, the One
 " being

ter, p. 11, 13, 22, 29. and in p. 32. he affords
us a notable Contradistinction. " That there

I 3

" is

" being perform'd with outward and Elementary Wa-
ter, which is a Creature, the Other Inward, and Spi-
ritually perform'd, by the Operation of the Holy
Ghost; which is of, and from the Essence of God,
as Creator. And yet this may be performed instru-
mentally too, by the same Power, by which the Dead
were raised, as hath been observed already, and shall
be more fully proved hereafter.

" Thus outward Baptism with Water, and the Inward
Baptism with the Spirit, can (I think) in no Sense be
called one Baptism, as the several Parts or Degrees
of Faith, may be called one Faith. And therefore as
no Scripture can be brought to prove, that Outward
and Inward Baptism do both go to make up the One
Baptism, *Eph. iv. 5.* So neither will the Comparison
here brought hold or prove it so; which I could shew
by many other Arguments besides this, which for
brevity I omit; thinking what I have said, may suf-
fice for Answer to this Comparison, or any other of
the same Kind, wherein the several Parts proceed
from one and the same Essence, and all agree with,
and center in one Subject. But I have more Compa-
risons yet to answer, made by the same Persons,
wherein the Subjects do more widely differ in some
Sense than the one Faith, from several Parts of it, as
thus,

" The Body (says *P. B. Appendix p. 37.*) which if
you respect its Make, consists of Spirit and Matter,
two Things of Natures the most different of any in
the World. Yet they hinder not the Union of the
Man, who is composed of both: Nay it is the Com-
position of these Two, that makes up the one Man,
insomuch that when these two are divided, the Man
is no more. For it is nothing else which we call
Death, but the Separation of Soul and Body."

" I

“ is a Baptism to be used (*saiſt he*) even thoſe
 “ of your Perſwaſion allow as well as we;
 “ but

“ I readily grant (*ſays J. Pike*) that Soul and Body
 “ are two very different Things, yet do make and con-
 “ ſtitute one Man; and as our Opponents farther ſay,
 “ where theſe two are ſeparated, the Man is no more;
 “ But to make this a Parallel wth the one Baptiſm,
 “ they muſt prove from Scripture, that Outward Bap-
 “ tiſm with Water and Inward Baptiſm with the Spirit,
 “ are as neceſſary, and have ſuch a Relation to one an-
 “ other to make up the one Baptiſm, *Eph. iv. 5.* As Bo-
 “ dy and Soul are neceſſary, and have ſuch Relation
 “ one to another to conſtitute and make up one Man;
 “ In doing this, they will do ſomething to the Purpoſe,
 “ and there will be no Need of theſe lame Compariſons,
 “ but till then, if they brought a Thouſand ſuch like,
 “ ’twill avail them nothing to ſupport their Notion.
 “ And indeed, till that be done, it will be a ſufficient
 “ Answer to this, and all other the like groundleſs As-
 “ ſertions. However for the Sake of ſome, I will ſhew
 “ the Inequality of the Compariſon between the one
 “ Baptiſm and the one Man; the Answer to which, will
 “ alſo ſerve to any other ſuch like Compariſon they
 “ make, wherein the Conjunction of the Parts are ne-
 “ ceſſary to denominate the Subject, and by the Sepa-
 “ ration of the Parts it ceaſeth to be.

“ Thus then, as a Man cannot be a Man, or ſo cal-
 “ led, before the Conjunction of Soul and Body; or
 “ ceaſes to be ſuch when they are ſeparated one from
 “ another by Death; ſo alſo by this Compariſon, Wa-
 “ ter-Baptiſm is not, nor can be called Baptiſm, but
 “ when accompanied with the Inward Baptiſm of the
 “ Spirit.

“ I then ask, will they ſay that all People in the
 “ World, who have been baptized with Water-Bap-
 “ tiſm, have been baptized with the Spirit? Sure I be-
 “ lieve they will not, and if they ſhould, the wicked
 and

“ but the Question is, *whether Baptism by the Spirit or Water*; and since there is a Doubt,
I 4 “ why

“ and abominable Lives and Conversations of Thou-
“ sands, nay what if I say, Millions, of those who have
“ either been baptized or sprinkled with Water; do
“ loudly bespeak the contrary. Well then, in such there
“ is Outward Baptism without the Inward, which com-
“ pared with Soul and Body that constitute a Man,
“ will not hold parallel; for as a Soul never join'd to a
“ Body (if proper so to speak) is no Man, nor can be so
“ called; or being join'd, if separated by Death, it
“ thereby ceases to be a Man: So by this Rule, Out-
“ ward Baptism with Water, without the Inward Bap-
“ tism of the Spirit, cannot be called Baptism at all,
“ much less the one Baptism of Christ.

“ Thus I think, 'tis as plain as can be, that Compa-
“ rison will not hold, which I could also shew by sever-
“ al Instances, which for brevity I omit; and as on
“ the one Hand it doth not hold, so on the other Hand
“ it contradicts the very Practice of those who make
“ these Comparisons, who not only call Water-Bap-
“ tism alone, true Baptism, but affirm, that who is
“ baptized (or sprinkled) with Water, is thereby rege-
“ rated and grafted into the Church, and made a Mem-
“ ber of Christ, a Child of God by Adoption, and an
“ Heir of the Kingdom of Heaven. Nay, some of the
“ very same Church of those who assert, that the Out-
“ ward and Inward Baptism make up the one Baptism,
“ do in point blank Contradiction to their Brethren,
“ positively assert that Water-Baptism alone, is the
“ one Baptism, *Eph. iv. 5.*” Thus far *Joseph Pike*, in his
Treatise of *Baptism* and the *Supper*, p. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,
31. By all which the judicious Reader may plainly apprehend,
that this *Norfolk* Author's Allegations are not only old thred-bare Stuff, long ago sufficiently refuted, but
that the same do necessarily involve him in divers inextricable Difficulties. For if he allows that the one Baptism

“ why should not you secure your self by u-
 “ sing WATER-BAPTISM.” What Words
 “ can

tism is Christian Baptism, and affirms the same consists of two Parts, *viz.* Water and the Spirit. And that there is as necessarily required the Conjunction of those Parts to constitute the one, or Christian Baptism, as there is of the Conjunction of Soul and Body, to constitute the one Man. And as a Man ceases to be such, both really and nominally, when the Soul is separated from the Body; so Water-Baptism, unless it be accompanied with the Baptism of the Spirit, is so far from being Christian Baptism, or the one Baptism of Christ, that it cannot be denominated any Baptism at all: And, what naturally flows from hence, but that none baptizeth with, or administreth, Christian Baptism, but he that baptizeth with the Spirit as well as Water; and how will this comport with our Author's terming it little better than Blasphemy to say, the Apostles baptized with the Holy Ghost, I leave to the considerate: Nor is any, according to this Notion, baptized with Christian Baptism, but such as are baptized with the Spirit, &c.

But how our Author and his Accomplices will, or can account for this, I must own, is a Mystery to me.— His third Question plainly imports (as will hereafter appear) that he does not believe a Minister of Christ can instrumentally give or administer the Spirit, even in an ordinary Way, so as the same may be distinguished from ones own Thoughts. They (*i. e.* P. B. and his Accomplices) cannot pretend to assert, that they have received Christian Baptism; for that would be equivalent with affirming that they are baptized with the Spirit as well as Water; and so necessarily lead 'em to solve their own Question, by telling us, how they distinguish the Spirit's Operation from their own Thoughts. But after all, what could our Author have in View, by endeavouring to hook in the Spirit with Water, to make up the one Baptism? Would it not have been more consistent,

can more plainly declare, there are two distinct and separate Baptisms; the one by the Spirit, and the other by Water?

O.

sistent, to have kept close to his Tenet, and without more ado, told us 'tis Water-Baptism? This would have been exactly correspondent to what he had before delivered, *viz.* "The Christian Baptism alone is administered in the *Name of the Father, &c.*"* And also to what his Elder Brother, *P. Hewet*, in his plain Answer, p. 46. *viz.* "By being washed with Water, in the *Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, accompanying his own Ordinance. This (*says he*) is called the one Baptism; (and his Reason follows) because (*says he*) although the Ordinances of the Gospel are frequently administered to Believers, this alone is never to be repeated, nor received a second Time, as the Bishop truly explained it."

This Bishop he mentions, was the Bishop of *Cork*, who likewise held the Washing with Water, to be the *One Baptism* Eph. iv. 5. as for *Hewet*, he was, as I apprehend, one of the *Church of England Clergy*.

O. Edwards has quite outstript all our Antagonists upon this Text. He makes a light Matter on't, to prove two distinct Baptisms from Eph. iv. 4, 5.

After having asserted, that Water-Baptism and the Spirit's Baptism are distinct from each other, he says, "Whosoever reads the Text will find, the Apostle therein doth not say, that our Lord hath not two Baptisms, and if they joyn the 4th Verse with the 5th they will find that Christ hath one Baptism which is contradistinguished from the one Spirit, which gives Life and Motion to the one Body. 2d Stroke p. 52.

Here we see he makes no Scruple at all to assert two Baptisms, and maintains that the one Baptism is that of Water, distinct from that of the Spirit. Many have endeavoured

* Letter, p. 27.

O. Edwards in his 2d *Stroke* (as he calls it) p. 52. frankly confesses, *That they are two distinct Baptisms.* “ I never said (*says he*) that “ *Water-Baptism* and the *Spirit's* was but one “ *Baptism*; I freely own (*says he*) they are “ *two, and distinct from each other.*”

Likewise these Texts, *viz: Mat. iii. 11, 12. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 26, 33. Acts v. and xi. 16.* make a full and clear Discrimination between 'em, as being distinct and separate Baptisms.

Now

deavoured by several Contrivances to make the Text conform to their own Notion, but he taking the Matter in hand, penetrated the Secret at once; they could find but one Baptism, but he readily found out two: The one he meets with in the 5th Verse. which is there called one Baptism, and which he says is *Water-Baptism*; and retrospecting to the 4th Verse, he wittily discovers the other, which the Apostte there calls one Spirit, and which, it seems, must be the *Spirit's Baptism* distinct from the one Baptism in Verse the 5th, which *O. E.* holds to be intirely *Water-Baptism* distinct from the Spiritual. Thus our Opponents are divided and subdivided. Suppose any of us should become a Convert, which of these must he follow? The Bishop of *Cork* and *Dr. Hewet*, who hold *One Baptism*, and that to be the *Washing with Water*; or *Parson Edwards*, that asserts *two distinct Baptisms*; or our *Norfolk Champion* and his Adherents, who make but *one Baptism* of two, or contract *two into one*? The Confusion and manifest Contradiction, that appears among the Advocates of *Water-Baptism*, is really a Reproach to the Christian Religion, and an evident Token, that they are neither conducted by the *One Spirit*, of the *One Faith*, nor experimentally know what the *One Baptism* means.

Now since 'tis an incontestable Point, that the Baptism with Water, and the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, are two different Baptisms, and distinct from each other. And the Apostle asserts no more than one Baptism in the Christian Church, *Eph. iv. 5.* it must be allowed to be one of the Two.

To maintain it to be the first, viz. *Water-Baptism*, would be diametrically opposite to *Mat. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 33.* which Texts declare Christ's Baptism to be the second, viz. that of the *Spirit*; and it would be erroneous to suppose the Apostle intended any other but Christ's Baptism.

2dly, It would make him perpetuate a Baptism which he confesses Christ sent him not to administer, *1 Cor. i. 17.*

3. It makes the Apostle confused and inconsistent with himself, as our Opponent is, viz. *To hold two Baptisms.* For 'tis undeniable that he asserted the *Baptism of the Spirit*, *1 Cor. xii. 13.*

4. It represents the Apostle to continue a Baptism, which our Antagonists themselves frankly own, *doth not save*: See *Burkit* on *1 Pet. iii. 21.* Whereas the Baptism of Christ is as necessary to Salvation as Faith is, *Mark xvi. 16.*

5. It makes him assign a corporeal Lotion for the Purgation of a spiritual Body ; for of such a Body the Apostle speaks, *Eph. iv. 4.*

But on the other Hand, if we apprehend it to mean the last, viz. *The Baptism of the Spirit*, we shall avoid all those Absurdities, there will be a perfect Harmony and Coherence throughout, and the Baptism will be *homogeneous* with the Body, and to be baptized or washed by it ; as the Body is a spiritual Body, so it is most consistent, that the Baptism, wherewith it is to be cleansed and sanctified, be a spiritual Baptism, agreeable to what the same Apostle delivered to the *Corinthians*, saying, *but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. 1 Cor. vi. 11.*

Nay one would think the Case is indisputably cleared up, by what he says *1 Cor. xii. 13.* For as he told the *Ephesians*, there is *one Body* and *one Baptism* ; so he told the *Corinthians*, *that by one Spirit they were all baptized into one Body.*

To conclude this Head. Seeing the One Baptism the Apostle speaks of, is undoubtedly the * Baptism of Christ, which is that of the *Spirit*,

* " The Baptism of Christ, who is the Lord, that
" Spirit, the Image of the invisible God, the quickning
" Spirit

Spirit, as is testified of in the four Evangelists
aforecited ; yea since this One Baptism is un-
questionably

“ Spirit, is that *ἐν Βαπτισμῷ* One Baptism spoken of in
“ *Eph. iv. One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*, for Jesus
“ Christ administering in himself, and his own spiritual
“ Nature, can only make us thus one with himself, and
“ with his own Body. The Baptism of Christ thus ad-
“ ministrated in his own spiritual Nature upon his, is
“ that very Baptism by which we are in the Fellowship
“ of his sufferings, and of his Death. *As many as are*
“ *baptized into Christ, are baptized into his Death, and as*
“ *many as are baptized εἰς Χριστόν into Christ, have put on*
“ *Christ* ; so that this Baptism by which we are all bap-
“ tized into Christ, and put on Christ and his Death,
“ is spiritual ; for Christ cannot be truly put on, nor
“ any Thing of his, his sufferings, Death or Re-
“ surrection, but in Spirit and in Truth, whereby we
“ are truly crucified and dead with him, to our selves
“ and the World, and alive with him in one Spirit ; the
“ same Spirit that raised up Jesus Christ shall also quick-
“ en our mortal Bodies.

“ The Baptism of Jesus Christ, is that whereby we
“ are baptized into his Body ; now his Body is a spiri-
“ tual one, and fashioned like his glorious one ; *by one*
“ *Spirit we are all baptized εἰς ἓν σῶμα into one Body, 1*
“ *Cor. xii. 13.* The Baptism of Christ is that whereby
“ we are compleat in him, now we are compleat in
“ him, only by being one with him in Spirit and
“ Nature, he being made unto us *Righteousness, Sancti-*
“ *fication, &c.* And thus we are said to be circumcised
“ with the Circumcision made without Hands, and bu-
“ ried with him in Baptism, wherein also we are risen
“ with him through Faith ; so that we are baptized in
“ him, as we are circumcised in him, that is, we are
“ all in him ; and as the *Circumcision is ἀχειροποίητος*
“ *made without Hands*, so is the Baptism, it being the
“ Apostle's whole Business in this Chapter (*viz. Col. ii.*)
“ to carry us and the *Colossians* up higher than Rudi-
“ ments, which perish with using.” *J. Saltmarsh, Some*
Beams, &c. p. 29, 30, 31.

questionably the Saving Baptism; and since according to the Apostle *Peter's* Testimony, it is not Water-Baptism that Saves, but the Baptism of the Spirit. What can be a more natural and just Consequence than that this one Baptism is no other than the Baptism of the Spirit?

PROPOSITION IV.

THAT the Catholic-Church, through every Age to this Day, practised the same Outward Water-Baptism, which the Apostles used.

This Proposition may be fairly collected from his 17, 18, 19, Pages, where he says, “ The Apostles did practise Water-
 “ Baptism, and the Catholick Church to this
 “ Day. The publick Nature of Water-
 “ Baptism being an outward Matter of Fact,
 “ of which Men's Senses are Judges, it is im-
 “ possible for the World to be imposed upon,
 “ nor ever can it in such a publick Matter of
 “ Fact. As the Practice of the Apostles is a
 “ most sure Rule to understand the Meaning
 “ of that Command they put in Execution, so
 “ the Practice of those who immediately suc-
 “ ceeded the Apostles, &c. is a certain Rule
 “ to know what the Practice and what
 “ the Sense of the Apostles were. And thus
 “ the Practice of the present Age in the Ad-
 “ ministration

“ ministration of Water-Baptism, is an un-
 “ deniable Evidence, that this was the Pra-
 “ ctice of the last Age, &c. All this makes
 “ it undeniably plain, the last Age did Pra-
 “ ctise the same outward Water-Baptism
 “ which is practised in this Age, and that
 “ the same was as certainly practised in the
 “ Age before the Last, and by the same
 “ Rule in the Age before that, and so on-
 “ ward to the Age of the Apostles. All
 “ Histories of the several Ages confirm the
 “ Truth of it”.

Reply. With respect to the Apostles baptiz-
 ing with Water, that they thereby put any
 Command of Christ in Execution, has been
 already sufficiently disprov'd in the preced-
 ing Part of this *Reply*.

As to the Proposition which is clearly con-
 tain'd in the above Quotation he offers not any
 Proof thereof, more than his bare *ipse dixit*.
 That all Histories of the several Ages con-
 firm, that the Catholick Church through e-
 very Age to this Time, practis'd the same
 Outward Water-Baptism, &c. I have Rea-
 son to think, he will, upon a strict Enquiry,
 find himself much mistaken; for History
 doth largely inform us, that there has been
 much Change and Innovation among the Pro-
 fessors of Christianity, touching Water-Bap-
 tism, since the Time of the Apostles, in se-
 veral material Points; even in early Days,
 viz.

viz. in the 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th. Centuries. And to descend nearer our own Times; 'tis obvious enough, that the Church of *England* differs from the long continued Practice of the Church of *Rome*, in some very considerable, if not essential Parts.

First they differ about its Definition, *Papists* define Water-Baptism to be that which actually Justifies and regenerates us. *Belarm. de Baptismo*, lib. 1. cap. which *Protestants* deny and oppose. *Synop. Papismi*. p. 56.

2. In Relation to the Form, its Derivation, &c. The *Papists* affirm, "That the Form to baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is not fully concluded out of Scripture, but delivered by Tradition, and say, the Command of Christ *Mat. 28.* may be understood, to baptize in the Faith, or Authority of the Trinity". *Belarmin. de Baptismo* l. 1. cap. 3.

But *Protestants* assert, "That that very Form is plainly proved out of Scripture". *Willet's Synop. Papismi* p. 563.

3. "In Respect to the Necessity thereof". *Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 7. Belarm. de Bapt. lib. 1. cap. 4. Synop. Pap. p. 564.*

4. Relating to the Administrators thereof. The *Romanists* hold, "That either Lay Men

“Men or Women, yea Pagans, though unbaptized themselves, may baptize in Case of Necessity”. *Belarm. de Baptismo*, lib. 1. cap. 7. *Synop. Pap.* 572. But the Church of *England* maintains, “That whoever baptize that are not Episcopally commission’d, are Usurpers and their Baptism is null and void”. See *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, the 1st, 2d, and 3d Parts.

5. They say, the *Papists* affirm, “That Infant Baptism is rather derived from Tradition than Scripture”. *Belarm. de Verbo Dei*, lib. 4. cap. 9. *Synop. Pap.* p. 572.

The Church of *England* holds, that it is grounded upon the Scripture, and undertakes to prove it, but indeed from very far fetch’d Consequences, and their Deductions are so unnatural and constrain’d as apparently manifest them Magisterial and Violent.

6. They vary about the Effects of Baptism: The *Papists* say, “That Sins are utterly extinguished by the Grace received in Baptism”. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 5. But *Protestants* will not allow it, *Synop. Pap.* p. 576.

7 The Church of *Rome* uses Cream, Salt, Spittle, Ephphatha’s and Insufflation in Baptism; all which *Protestants* refuse and abandon: Besides several other Particulars there are, wherein *Papists* and *Protestants* vary
K from

from each other, relating to Water-Baptism, as may be seen in Controversial Tracts Extant since the Reformation. But these here given may fully Demonstrate, that there is an Incoherence betwixt the *Roman* and *English* Churches in divers Material, and what they call Essential, Parts respecting that Practice.

Now if the Church of *England* holds, that the Church of *Rome* was not Apostolical in the Practice of Water-Baptism, but wanted a Reformation, and therefore dissented from her, then I suppose it will be granted, that the Church of *Rome* does not, nor has not for many Ages practised the same Outward Water-Baptism, which was used in the Apostles Age. And if our Author maintains that the Catholick Church has through every Age, from the Apostles to this Day, practised the same Outward Water-Baptism which the Apostles did, I desire he would inform us in his next, what he holds to have been this Church that hath so practised Water-Baptism, if the *Romish* must be excluded; and how he will support an Episcopal Commission? In short, he must either maintain, in Opposition to the Current of Protestant Theologists, in their Contests with Popery, that the Church of *Rome* is, or has been for many Ages, this Catholick Church he intends; or else he must of Necessity prove another, wholly exclusive of that of *Rome*, which

which has constantly to this Day from the Time of the Apostles, practised the same Outward Baptism which the Apostles used. And let him remember it must be an Episcopal one too, otherwise he will find himself utterly at a loss in the Probation of an Authentic Commission, and if that appears defective, it spoils the whole Business.

And to be plain, it is not allowed that the Church of *England* her self is conformable to Scripture, or primitive Practice, relating to Water-Baptism, but very remote therefrom, in several (called by some) Essential Parts.

1. In Mode, by changing Dipping for Sprinkling.

2. In Relation to the Subjects thereof, by administering it to Infants instead of adult Believers only.

For Confirmation of which, hear what our Author himself says, in his Appendix p. 50.
 " Every Person in the primitive Times made
 " Confession of his Faith in Christ, and pro-
 " mised to forsake his former wicked Courses
 " before he had the Rite of Water-Baptism
 " conferr'd upon him.—In partaking of which
 " Ordinance, they had engaged themselves by
 " two Significant Ceremonies, whereof the
 " one Part, Plunging under the Water, re-
 " ferring to the Burial of Christ, &c. —
 " The other Part, the Coming out of the

“ Water referring to the Resurrection of
“ Christ”.

Can there be a plainer Testimony than this, to prove that the Church of *England's* Practice of Infant-Baptism and Sprinkling has not any Footsteps in the New Testament, or the most primitive Antiquity or Tradition, but are meerly Innovations since the Primitive Times.

’Tis undeniably evident, that the Terms in which he has laid down his Assertion, do fairly imply, if not expressly declare, Infant-Baptism to be destitute both of Primitive Practice and Precept. *Every Person* (says he) *in the Primitive Times made Confession, &c.* If every Person made Confession of his Faith in Christ, and promised to forsake his former wicked Courses, before he had the Rite of Baptism conferr’d upon him; then consequently not one Infant was baptized, since the same was not capable of making any such Confession and Promise.

And if they, in the Primitive Times, did not baptize any Infants, then it is safe to conclude that there was not any Law or Precept that required such a Practice; nor yet that the same was accounted either Laudable or Expedient; more especially seeing our Opponents maintain that Water-Baptism is the Remedy

Remedy of * Original Sin, and considering that the Children of Believers then, who were born before their Parents Conversion, may, according to their † Doctrine, be supposed to have been more contaminated therewith, than any that proceeded from Christian Parents since, as being generated and brought forth when the greatest Infidelity, Idolatry and all Impurities reigned in their Parents; so that if Sin be Hereditary, and Water-Baptism the Remedy thereof, then to be sure that was the only Time to have applied it.

Our Author, p. 18. says, “ As the Practice of the Apostles is a most sure Rule to understand the Meaning of that Command they put in Execution; so the Practice of those, who immediately succeeded the Apostles, who were Contemporaries with them, and learned the Faith from their Mouths, is a certain Rule to know what the Practice, and what the Sense of the Apostles were”. But seeing that, according to what he affirms, neither the Apostles nor their immediate Successors (which I account the Phrase [Primitive Times] to comprehend) did at all practise Infant-Baptism

* Afferimus, certum esse, Christum Sacramentum Baptismi instituisse in remedium Originalis Peccati, & ad reatus ejusdem veram Solutionem. *Sam. Ward*
Thesis 1. de Baptismatis Infantis vi & Efficacia.

† Our Opponents.

tism, it thence follows that no such Thing was required. If the Practice of the Apostles be a most sure Rule to understand the Meaning of the Command they put in Execution, then their not practising Infant-Baptism must be a most sure Rule to understand, that the Command they (are supposed to) put in Execution by Practice, did not in the Least require it.

By all which, it is sufficiently Evident, that Infant-Baptism is altogether Extrascriptural, void of both Precept and Example, and nothing else but an human Invention crept in since the Primitive Times.

What Commendation the Clergy, &c. may have Reason to return our Author and his Assistants, for their Performances, I shall not determine, but do think, I may safely venture to say, that he has given their Cause the greatest Shake of any that ever appeared in its Defence against us. *First*, by his asserting the Abolition of *John's* Baptism. *Secondly*, By his thus treating their Darling *Pedo-Baptism*. ——— But lest any of the *Pedo-Baptists* should be too Censorious with our Author for this his plain Dealing with their Practice, I shall in order for his Support, and the Confirmation of his Assertion, insert the Sentiments of two or three learned Bishops upon the Point.

Dr. Barlow Bishop of Lincoln, in his Letter
 to J. Tombs says, " I do believe and know
 that there is neither Precept nor Example
 for Pede-Baptism, nor any just Evidence for
 it, for above Two Hundred Years after
 Christ: that *Tertullian* condemns it as an un-
 warrantable Custom; and *Nazianzen* a
 good while after him, dislikes it too. Sure
 I am, that in the Primitive Times, they
 were *Catechumeni*, then *Illuminati* or *Bap-*
tizati.—— The Truth is, I do believe,
 Pede-Baptism, how or by whom I know
 not, came into the World in the Second Cen-
 tury; and in the Third and Fourth began
 to be practised, though not generally, and
 defended as Lawful, from the Text gros-
 ly Misunderstood, *John* iii. 5. Upon the
 like gross Mistake of *John* vi. 53 they
 did for many Centuries, both in the *Greek*
 and *Latin* Church, communicate Infants,
 and give them the Lord's Supper: And
 I do confess, they might do both as well
 as either. But altho' they baptized some
 Infants, and thought it lawful so to do, yet
Austin was the first that ever said it was
 necessary.

" I have read (*says he*) what my Learned
 and worthy Friends Dr. *Hammond*, Mr.
Baxter, and others, say in Defence of it;
 and I confess, I wonder not a little that
 Men of such great Parts should say so
 much to so little Purpose; for I have not as
 yet

“ yet seen any Thing like an Argument
 “ for it. Thus Dr. *Barlow* Bishop of *Lin-*
coln, *Davy* of Baptism p. 63.

Bishop *Taylor* says. “ From the Action
 “ of Christ's Blessing Infants, to infer
 “ they are to be baptized, proves nothing
 “ so much, as that there is a want of better
 “ Arguments; for the Conclusion would
 “ with more Probability be derived thus:
 “ Christ blessed Infants, and so dismissed
 “ them, but baptized them not; therefore
 “ Infants are not to be baptized”. *Liberty*
of Prophecy p. 230.

Ibid. — “ To which if we add (*says he*)
 “ That the Parents of St. *Augustin*, St.
 “ *Hierom*, and St. *Ambrose*, although they
 “ were *Christians*, yet did not baptize their
 “ Children before they were Thirty Years
 “ of Age. It will be very considerable in
 “ the Example, and of great Efficacy for
 “ destroying the supposed Necessity or De-
 “ rivation from the Apostles,

“ But however, 'tis against the perpetu-
 “ tual Analogy of Christ's Doctrine to bap-
 “ tize Infants: For besides that Christ never
 “ gave any Precept to baptize them, nor
 “ ever himself nor his Apostles (that appears)
 “ did baptize any of them; p. 239, and 240.
 “ — The Baptizing of Infants does rush us
 “ upon such Inconveniencies, which in other
 “ Questions

“ Questions we avoid like Rocks, which will
 “ appear if we Discourse thus ; Either Bap-
 “ tism produces spiritual Effects, or it pro-
 “ duces them not. If it produces not any, why,
 “ is such Contention about it, what are we the
 “ nearer Heaven if we are baptized ? and if it
 “ be neglected what are we the farther off ?—

“ Either Baptism is a meer Ceremony, or
 “ it implies a Duty on our Part. If it be a
 “ Ceremony only, how does it sanctifie us,
 “ or make the Comers thereunto perfect ?
 “ If it implies a Duty on our Part, how
 “ then can Children receive it who cannot
 “ do Duty at all ? *Ibid.* p. 241, 242.

The Learned *Bossuet* Bishop of *Meaux*,
 saith, “ As for Infants, those of the pretend-
 “ ed reformed Religion indeed say, their
 “ Baptism is founded on the Scripture, but
 “ they produce no Passage Express to
 “ that Purpose, but argue from very re-
 “ mote, not to say very doubtful, and even
 “ very false Consequences. ’Tis certain that
 “ all the Proofs they bring from the Scripture
 “ on this Subject, have no Force at all.”
Treatise of the Communion under both Kinds,
 Part 1st. *Du Veil* on *Acts* p. 281.

And that the Practice of Sprinkling is an
 Innovation since the first Ages of Christianity.
 I could produce a Cloud of Witnesses, even
 from the *Pedo-Baptists* themselves. See Dr.
Hammond’s

138 *The Quaker's Answer to the*

Hamond's Practical Catechism p. 365, and 369. *Casauban* on *Mat.* iii. 6. *Grotius* on the same. *Dr. Taylor's Rules of Conscience* lib. 3. cap. 4. *Calvin's Institut.* lib. 4. cap. 15. Sec. 19. *Luther de Baptismo.* Tom. 1. Folio 71. Tom. 2. Folio 79. *The Assembly of Divines* on *Acts* iii. 38. *Dr. Cave's Primitive Christianity*, p. 213, 214. *Taylor's Ductor Dubitan.* lib. 3. c. 4.

'Tis to be especially remarked, That when any of the Clergy, or their Accomplices, encounter the *Quakers* on the Topic of Baptism, they commonly, in the Maintaining of their Assertions, are obliged to forsake the Principles and Practices of their own Church, and turn profound *Baptists*. The Truth of which is clearly evinced by what our Author has express'd, not only in the 5th Page of his Appendix as is before observed, but also in several places in his Letter, as, p. 20, 24.

And I do not question but the next *Baptist*, that appears in Print against the *Pedo-Baptists* and *Sprinklers*, will, if he meets with our Author's *Pamphlets*, lay hold of his Assertions, and improve the same to Arguments very fatal to *Pedo-Baptism*. Sure I am I have met with many Quotations brought by *Anti-Pedo-Baptists* from *Pedo-baptist* Authors, not half so much to the Purpose, as what our *Norfolk* Author affords.

Again

Again, when any of the aforesaid Party are closely engaged in Defence of Pedo-baptism and Sprinkling against the *Anabaptists*, they are forced for want of Scripture Evidence, miserably to take Sanctuary under that Old *Papish* Subterfuge, *Tradition*, or the Practice of the Church; thereby eminently verifying the Saying of the *French* Bishop. "Experience, (*says he*) has shewn, that all the Attempts of the Reformed to confound the *Anabaptists* by the Scripture, have been Weak; and therefore they are at last obliged to alledge to them the Practice of the Church.—When the pretended Reformed believe they have the Word of God very Expressly on their Side, they are not wont to build on the perpetual Practice of the Church. But in this Case (*i. e.* Infant Baptism) because the Scripture furnishes them with nothing by which they are able to stop the Mouths of the *Anabaptists*, it was necessary to rely on something else, and at the same Time to confess that in these Matters (*i. e.* Pedo-baptism and Sprinkling) the perpetual Practice of the Church is of inviolable Authority. *

However

* L'experience a fait voir que tout ce qu'ont tenté nos Reformez pour confondre les Anabaptistes l'Ecriture a été foible, Aussi sont ils obligez de leur alleguer enfin la Pratique. — Quand les P. Reformez

“ However the World goes (says Bishop
 “ *Taylor*) none of the Reformed Church can
 “ pretend this Argument (*i. e.* Tradition) a-
 “ gainst this Opinion (*i. e.* Anti-pedo-bap-
 “ tism) because they who reject Tradition
 “ when it is against them, must not pretend
 “ it at all for them.” *Liberty of Prophecy*, p.
 273.

3dly. In making the Sign of the Cross on
 the sprinkled Person's Forehead.

What our worthy Friend *Richard Claridge*
 (who was sometime a Priest of the Church of
England) has said concerning this Ceremony,
 in his Book called *Melius Inquirendum*. p.
 41, 42, 43. may very properly be inserted
 here, which is as follows.

“ The Cross or making the Sign of it upon
 “ the sprinkled Person's Forehead; this is con-
 “ fessed by * Bishop *Taylor* to be a Ritual or
 Ceremony

mez croient avoir le Parole de Dieu bien expresse,
 ils n'ont pas accoustume de se fonder sur la Pratique
 perpetuelle de l'Eglise, mais icy ou l'Ecriture ne leur
 fournit rien, par ou il puissent fermer la bouche aux
 Anabaptistes, ils fallu s'appuyer d'ailleurs, & tout en-
 semble avouer quen ces Matiers la Pratique de l'Eglise
 est d'une inviolable Autorite. *De la Commun- sous*
les deux especies, Partie 2.

* *Ductor Dubit.* l. 3. c. 4.

Ceremony, that is not of divine Ordinance,
 or Apostolical Practice; but a † Ceremony
 instituted of Men, as *Voetius* truly observes.
 And yet the Compilers of the Book of Con-
 stitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, call the
 Sign of the Cross a * Lawful outward Cere-
 mony and an honourable Badge. And
Richard Hooker termeth it an holy Sign, and
 attributes great Virtue to it, as being a Mean
 to work our Preservation from Reproach,
 a silent Teacher, and that we are by the
 Cross faithfully admonished of our Duty.
 Yea, he citeth *Cyprian*, that the Cross purifieth
 the Forehead: But nothing can speak more
 fully for it than the *Common-Prayer Book* it-
 self in these Words. “ We receive this
 Child into the Congregation of Christ’s
 Flock, and do Sign him with the Sign of
 the Cross, in token that hereafter he shall
 not be ashamed to confess the Faith of
 Christ crucified, and manfully to fight un-
 der his Banner, against Sin, the World,
 and the Devil, and to continue Christ’s
 faithful Soldier and Servant unto his Lives
 End.” Which giveth it the very Form, ac-
 cording to their Church’s Definition, of one
 of their Sacraments; for here is the outward
 and visible Sign, viz. the Cross, and the
 supposed

† Est Ceremonia ab hominibus instituta, *Disput.*
 Par. 3. p. 266. * *Can.* 30.
 || *Ecclesiastical Polity*, lib. 1. Sect. 65. p. 248.
 Edit. 1666.

• supposed Inward and Spiritual Grace, viz.
 • Confession of the Faith of Christ crucified,
 • manfully fighting under his Banner &c.

• But if our Adversaries object, it is not or-
 • dained by Christ himself, which is another
 • Part of the Definition; then I demand why do
 • they use it? yea, why do they read the Words
 • before quoted? since it is expressly said by
 • them, * Nothing is ordained to be read, but
 • the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scrip-
 • tures, or that which is agreeable to the same.

• Judge, *Reader*, whether this is not a Con-
 • tradiction to themselves and a manifest Pro-
 • famation of Water-Baptism. Will they falsely
 • charge us with a prophane Contempt, because
 • we only Disuse it; and yet be themselves
 • truly guilty of a prophane Abuse in their
 • constant Practice of it. † *Dr. Willet* speaking
 • of the Sign of the Cross, saith, *Having no*
 • *Warrant in the Word, it is a Tradition of*
 • *Men and not of Christ.* And *Dr. Fulk*
 • tell us, ‖ That *Valentinus* the Herenick
 • was the first that ever made any great Ac-
 • count of it, as testifieth *Ireneus*, l. i. c. 1.

• And

• Preface to the *Common-Prayer Book*, concerning
 the Service of the Church.

† *Synop. Pap.* p. 472.

‖ *Annos. on Luke* 24.

And what Zeal have some manifested for the Use of this unscriptural Ceremony? Bishop *Wren* made it a Part of one of the Articles to be enquired of, within the Diocess of *Norwich*, in his first Visitation; Doth he, that is, the Minister, ever use and never omit both to take the Child in his Hands, and also to make the Sign of the Cross, so as to touch the Child's Forehead in making the same? A strange Inquiry! and this among many others no less superstitious, was put to the Wardens to be answered, by Presentment upon Oath.

It would be too long to write the History of this Ceremony; and therefore I conclude with *Thomas Cartwright*, † "Although it be the Word of God, that we should not be ashamed of the Cross of Christ, yet it is not the Word of God, that we should be kept in Remembrance and Observation of that by two Lines drawn a Cross one over another, in the Child's Forehead; but a Fond Toy, and Idle Device of Man's Brain:" And with a Passage I have read concerning † Bishop *Andrews*, who disputing with Cardinal

* See his *Articles* presented Anno 1636.

† Reply to Dr. *Whitgift's* Answer to the Admonition to the Parliament. p. 171.

‡ Sober Inquiry into the Reasons of the Serious Inequality. p. 334.

• dinal *Peronne*, about Ceremonies, urged ve-
 • ry smartly, “ That Men ought not to add
 • to God’s Word, lest he lose his Part in the
 • Book of Life ; the politick Cardinal asks,
 • Why then do you retain the Cross in Baptism?
 • The Bishop answered, because Authority
 • Enjoins it. And for the same Reason,
 • replied the Cardinal, we retain all the rest
 • of the Ceremonies,

• For why may they not use all the other
 • Popish Ceremonies, as well as this? The
 • *Papists* Exorcise, Conjure and Exsufflate the
 • Evil Spirit from the Party baptized ; touch
 • his Ears and Nostrils with Spittle, that his
 • Ears may be open to hear the Word, and
 • his Nostrils to discern between the Smell of
 • Good and Evil : Sign not only his Forehead,
 • but his Mouth, Eyes, Ears, Nostrils, and
 • Breast also, that all thereby may be defend-
 • ed. Put hallowed Salt into his Mouth that
 • he may be seasoned with Wisdom, and pre-
 • served from Putrifying in Sin : Anoint him
 • with holy Oil in his Breast, that he may be
 • kept safe from evil Suggestions ; and be-
 • tween his Shoulders, that he may receive
 • Strength to bear the Lord’s Burden ; and on
 • the Top of his Head, to shew he is become
 • a Christian ; put a white Garment upon him,
 • in token of Regeneration ; a Vail upon his
 • Head, in Sign of his being crowned with a
 • Diadem ; and a burning Taper in his Hand,
 • to fulfil that saying of Christ. *Let your*

Light

*Light so shine before Men, that they seeing your Good Works, may glorify your Father which is in Heaven, Mat. v. 16. **

“ Why may not the *English* Clergy, I
 “ say, use these and other *Papish* Ceremonies,
 “ as well as the Cross in Water-Baptism,
 “ since neither the One, nor other, have any
 “ Foundation but in human Authority, and
 “ and are equally Significant or Symboli-
 “ cal. Thus *Claridge*.

Fourthly, What Text can our Author or any of his Community produce, that expressly proves, that the Apostles used the same Form which the *English* Clergy use, viz. *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?* *Zuinglius* says plainly. That Jesus Christ did not in these Words (*Βαπτίζωντες αὐτὸς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, &c.*) institute a Form of Baptism, which we should use, as Divines have hitherto falsely taught.

And the *Papists* themselves, affirm (as *Dr. Willet* observes) “ That this Form of Baptism is
 L not

* *Anatomy of Popery* p. 28, 29. See also *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 557.

† *Christus Jesus Baptismi Formulam quā uteremur his Verbis, non Instituit, quemadmodum Theologi hactenus tradiderant. Zuing. lib. de Baptismi. p. 56. Tom. 2. Oper.*

" not fully concluded out of Scripture, but
 " delivered by Tradition. *Synop. Pap.* p.
 563.

Methinks our Author should have been well assured, that his own Church runs exactly Parallel with Apostolic Practice, before he had been so hasty as to maintain that every Age did. But by what has been said, 'tis very discernible that the Church of *England* doth abundantly vary therefrom, as being attended with such manifest Alteration and Innovation, as may sufficiently support a direct Negation of * its being the same Outward Water-Baptism, that was used in the Apostles Time. Nor do I believe any Religious Society in *England* so Corresponds in Practice therewith, as may properly and strictly denominate theirs the same. So that to demonstrate *Whom* or *What*, this Catholic-Church he speaks of, is, or has been, that practised, to this very Day, the same outward Baptism, which the Apostles used, may perhaps prove an harder Task than he or any of his Assisting Doctors have ever dreamed of.

And on the other Hand, suppose it could be made appear, even to a Demonstration, that the same Outward Baptism, as he Asserts, has been constantly practised from the Time of the

* The Water-Baptism the Church of *England* uses.

the Apostles to this very Day ; unless it had been continued in Obedience to a positive Command of Christ, which plainly required such a Performance, (the which we are well assur'd can never be produc'd) what doth it amount unto more than *Tradition*, or at best, but an Imitation of Scripture Examples? “ * And it “ evidently appears (says Dr. *Stillingfleet* Bp. “ of *Worcester*) that all obligatory Force is “ taken off from the Examples themselves, “ and resolv'd into one of these two former, “ viz. the moral Nature of the Action, or a “ Positive Law ; and therefore, (says he) those “ who plead the Obligatory Nature of Scrip- “ ture Examples, must either produce the “ moral Nature of these Scripture Examples, “ or else a Rule binding us to follow these “ Examples.” But I imagine none will affirm, that Water-Baptism is an Emanation from the Law of Nature, as being an Action in it self of moral Fitness, or *Eternal Reckitude* : Nor has our Author, (or any other that appear'd before him) notwithstanding his specious Pretences, been able to produce any Command or positive Law of God, declaring the perpetual Duration thereof.

Therefore to go about to impress its Observation on the Account of *Tradition*, or what he call'd the *Practice of the Church*, (without producing such a positive Law) is neither
L. 2 consistent

consistent with Evangelical Religion, nor Natural Reason.

Ibid. p. 19. " If Water-Baptism was an human Invention, or superstitiously either obtruded or continued in the Church, some one would be found in less than Sixteen Hundred Years to have open'd his Mouth against it."

In Answer hereunto, observe the following Accounts, as the same stand in *Fuller's Reply to Boyce*, p. 119, 120, 121.

" *Irenæus*, who lived in the next Age after the Apostles, mentions, *lib. 1. cap. 18.* Christians that disused these Ceremonies, saying, " that the Mystery of the Unspeakable Invisible Power, ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible Elements, nor that of incomprehensible, and incorporeal Things, be represented by sensible and corporeal Things; but that the Knowledge of the Unspeakable Majesty is it self perfect Redemption or Baptism."

" *Tertullian* wrote a Book of Baptism about 100 Years after the Apostles, against the Doctrine of one *Quintilla*, a Woman Preacher, that had been at *Cartbage* a little before; and taught, " That Water-Baptism was needless; and that Faith alone was sufficient

“ ficient, &c. to whom he intimates many
“ adher’d.

“ *Augustin*, in his *Book de Baptismo*, menti-
“ ons Christians about 200 Years after the
“ Apostles, that say, Baptism in Water does
“ no Body good.

“ *Theodoret*, lib. 4. chap. 10. mentions
“ some about 260 Years after the Apo-
“ stles, that say, There is no Profit accru-
“ ing to the Baptized by Baptism; and that
“ they had Noted Men of their Sect, viz.
“ *Dadas’s*, *Sabbas’s*, *Adelphius’s* and *Simeons*,
“ the whole Number then must be considera-
“ ble to have so many noted Men among ’em.

“ *Dacherius’s Spicilegium*, Tom. 13. says,
“ That those who adher’d to one *Gundulphus*
“ about *Anno 1025*. being some of them ex-
“ amined by the Bishop of *Cambrai*, denied,
“ That Baptism could do any Good to In-
“ fants; and being farther interrogated, con-
“ fess’d, They thought Water-Baptism of no
“ Use to any one, *Infant* or *Adult*.

“ *Florentius*, in his *Annals of France*, lib.
“ 3. says, King *Robert* of *France*, caused to be
“ burnt alive, about fourteen of the chief
“ Clergy, and more Noble of the *Laicks* of the
“ City of *Orleans*, for denying the Outward
“ Baptism and Supper.

" *Everaninus* of the Diocess of *Cologne*, about
 " 1140, speaks of a People that contemn the
 " *Sacraments*.

" *Peter*, Abbot of *Clugny*, Anno 1146,
 " says, *Brute* with *Henry* his Disciple, and
 " their Followers, did hold that not only what
 " *Berengarius* had said, viz. That there is no
 " *Transubstantiation* in the *Sacrament*, was true,
 " but also that the *Sacrament* is no more to be
 " administred since *Christ's* Time.

" *Exbertus Schonagiensis*, wrote a Treatise
 " Anno 1160. against the *Cathari* or *Puritans*,
 " of whom he says, They hold no Water-
 " Baptism at all does any Good for Salvation.

" *William* of *Newberry*, mentions Thirty
 " that came out of *Germany* into *England*, a-
 " bout 1170. that denied *Baptism* and the *Eu-*
 " *charist*; the chief of them were *Gerardus*
 " and *Dulcimus*.

" The famous *Waldenses* laid little Stress
 " upon the Outward Baptism and Supper;
 " finding fault with the *Papists* for relying too
 " much on these Things. Some of 'em, says
 " *Reynerus*, hold, That the *Sacrament* of *Bap-*
 " *tism* of Material Water, and other *Sacra-*
 " *ments*, profit nothing to Salvation." So
 " far *Fuller*.

Dr. Willett says, "*Socrates* sheweth, in *Theſe*
ſalia, by Reason of deferring Baptism till
Eaſter, it happen'd that many, yea the
 most died without Baptism, &c. which
 shews, (*says he*) that the Church then had
 no such Opinion of the Necessity of this
 Sacrament; for then they would not have
 deferred it to the Danger of so many." *Syn-*
op. Papiſmi. p. 567.

In the Reign of King *Charles* the 1st, one
John Saltmarsh, a noted Preacher in the County
 of *Kent*, published a Discourse against Water-
 Baptism.

The famous Dr. *Dell*, Master of *Gonvil* and
Caius Colledge in *Cambridge*, a Man eminent
 for Learning and Piety in the last Age, set
 forth a Treatise, intituled *Βαπτισμὸς Ἀδελφῶν*
Or the Doctrine of Baptisms, reduced from its
Ancient and Modern Corruptions, &c. In which
 he plainly demonstrates, that Water-Baptism
 is not an Ordinance of the Gospel, but that
 the Baptism which Christ instituted *Mat. xxviii.*
19. is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Remarks upon his Conclusion.

Pag. 30. "As our Saviour came down
 from Heaven, on Purpose to shew and
 lead us the Way thither; why should
 weak, short-sighted Man pretend to be wi-
 ser than Wisdom it self? Why should we

“ find fault with his Institutions, as being too
 “ much upon the Outward, and think we can
 “ and may spiritualize them finer, and make
 “ the Way shorter than he has done ?

Reply, Methinks our Author should have fairly proved Water-Baptism to be an Institution of Christ, before he had suggested our Disuse thereof to be a finding fault with his Institutions. We are not convinced that Water-Baptism is any Institution of Christ; nor has *P. B.* or any that preceded him, prov'd it such. I freely own, he calls it “ * An Ordinance of Christ's Appointment; the Entrance into his Church; the Door of Salvation; the † Seal of the New Covenant, the ‖ Institution of the Son of God, &c.” but never so much as shews us the Text where it is so denominated; and the Reason why is obvious; for not one is to be got. And it is somewhat strange to me, what could be our Author's Inducement, to attribute to that Ceremony such reverend Titles as these, unless it was to strike the greater Awe and Veneration into the Minds of the *Vulgar*; but, as Names have no transmuting Influence upon the Nature of Things, so his giving Water-Baptism such high Appellations, is no more affecting to us, than if he had express'd himself consonant to the Apostle *Peter* in denying

it to be that which *saves*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. and *Paul*, in excluding it his Evangelical Commission. 1 Cor. i. 17.

And what doth he talk of spiritualizing it finer: Does not Dr. *Burkitt* plainly tell us, "That it is the Inward (or Spiritual) Baptism only, that *saves*." And Bp. *Taylor*, That "the Spiritual Baptism, is that wherewith "Christ baptizeth all his?" What just Ground is there then, to blame us for pleading for, and depending on the same? Surely none at all. And judge, *Reader*, whether the *Quakers*, who hold, That none can be a Member of Christ, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of God, without Inward Sanctification produced by the Internal Operation of the Holy Ghost; or they who account, that the Sprinkling, (or Application) of a little Elementary Water on a Child's Forehead, making thereon the Sign of the Cross, repeating some Form of Prayer, and the like, *make it a Member of Christ, a Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven,** have made the Way SHORTER than Christ has done, who said, *That whosoever does not take up his daily Cross and follow him, cannot be his Disciple.*

Ibid. "As necessary as the Waters of *Jordan* were to the cleansing of *Naaman*, so "necessary

* Church of England Catechism.

“ necessary are the Waters of Baptism to the
 “ cleansing our Souls.—Pag. 31. He repre-
 “ sents it to be as dangerous and presumptuous
 “ to neglect the Waters of Baptism, as for one
 “ to refuse his daily Bread.—“ That who-
 “ ever wilfully neglects being so baptized af-
 “ ter several Remonstrances of his Duty, can-
 “ not have any Grounds for Hope of Salva-
 “ tion by the Gospel Covenant, because (*says*
 “ *he*) he wilfully neglects a positive Precept,
 “ the Observance of which our Saviour has
 “ commanded.”

Pag. 32. He makes a Sort of a Comparison
 betwixt the Neglect of Water-Baptism and
Atheism—and asks “ What fatal Consequen-
 “ ces must the Neglect of it bring?—Pag.
 33. He intimates, “ That it is not against
 “ Reason, that the Waters of Baptism should
 “ mystically wash away Sin; because the Spi-
 “ rit of God mov'd at first upon the Face of
 “ the Waters. *Gen. i. 2.* to impregnate and
 “ make them fructifie.”

Pag. 34, and 35, “ Our Saviour Christ,
 “ (*says he*) has constituted a Church, invited
 “ all Men into it, to partake of the Privileges
 “ of it, viz. *the Remission of Sin, and the Pro-*
 “ *mise of Eternal Life:* Has appointed Wa-
 “ ter-Baptism as the initiating Sign and Seal,
 “ whereby Men are to be made Members of
 “ his Church, and incorporated thereinto:
 “ and whatever you may think, until you
 “ have

“ have thus in a publick Manner entred your
 “ self into the Congregation of Christ’s Flock,
 “ and by the Sign and Seal of Water-Baptism,
 “ been admitted into his Church, you can
 “ plead no Claim to the Promises of the Gos-
 “ pel, which are annexed to that very Sign
 “ or Seal. You cannot even call your self a
 “ Christian. You have no Right or Title to
 “ that Name, till you have made your self
 “ Christ’s Disciple, in the Manner and Way
 “ which he has prescribed, appointed and
 “ commanded, which is Water-Baptism.

Pag. 36. “ —How can you expect to
 “ reap the Benefit of his (i. e. *Christ’s*) Re-
 “ demption, if you will not use the Means
 “ your Redeemer has order’d and appointed?
 “ if you will not be baptized with Water, be
 “ ingrafted into Christ’s Church, and become
 “ an outward Member of it, and a Professor
 “ of Christianity?

Pag. 37. “ Baptism is an outward BADGE
 “ of Christianity, by being the outward
 “ Form appointed to admit People as Mem-
 “ bers of the Church of Christ, and whereby
 “ they own themselves to be such before Men.
 “ But those who will not wear this BADGE as
 “ a Confession to Christ before Men, Christ
 “ will not confess them before his Father in
 “ Heaven.

“ And

“ And thus having set forth the Folly and
 “ Danger of neglecting this Condition of Sal-
 “ vation ; let me now turn the comfortable
 “ Side towards you, and shew the Benefits and
 “ Advantage you especially may reap by re-
 “ ceiving Water-Baptism. Pag. 38. Know
 “ ASSUREDLY, that if you will come before
 “ the visible Church of God, and profess un-
 “ feigned Sorrow for thy past Sins, and pro-
 “ mise Amendment of Life for the future, and
 “ declare thy sincere Belief, that our Saviour
 “ Jesus Christ is the *Son of God*, the *Messiah*
 “ sent into the World for the *Redemption* of
 “ *Mankind*, that he *suffered* for our *Salvation*,
 “ and is now set down at the *Right Hand of*
 “ *God*, interceding for *Us* ; that he planted a
 “ *Church*, into which thou desirest to be ad-
 “ mitted ; as soon as thou art made a *Member*
 “ thereof by the initiating Rite of *Water-Bap-*
 “ *tism*, ALL thy Sins which thou hast com-
 “ mitted from thy Youth up to that Day, shall
 “ be FORGIVEN thee. Thy PARDON will be
 “ sealed and conveyed to thee, in the Ordi-
 “ nance of *WATER-BAPTISM*. ”

Reply, To give distinct Answers to these
 Assertions, would be unnecessary, since the
 whole is grounded upon a Supposition, or an
 Opinion of Water-Baptism's being an *Ordi-*
nance of the Gospel ; the Door of Salvation ; that
which ingrafts into the Church of Christ ; the
Badge of Christianity, &c. Not any of which,
 we are confident, can be prov'd, (nay I think

I may venture to say the direct contrary has been fully prov'd :) So that, though he strenuously impresses such Positions, as most certain and infallible Truths ; yet are they, in reality, no more than the Products of human Conception, issuing from a Mind greatly influenc'd with the Spirit of Bigotry and Priestcraft, (which apparently flows through every Paragraph ;) but have not one solid Stone of demonstrative Truth to support 'em.

What Evidence or Authority can our Author give, to prove that the Waters of Baptism are as necessary to the cleansing of the Soul, as the Waters of *Jordan* were, to the cleansing of *Naaman's* Leprosy ?

The Text is clear touching *Naaman*, as expressly declaring, both a positive Command for the Performance of the Action, and the concomitant Effect thereof appearing in undeniable Matter of Fact.

When he has produced the like Evidence to evince the Necessity of Baptismal Water for the Purgation of the Soul, I assure him he may depend upon my intire Submission, if not Conversion. — But if Scripture Evidence may be allowed to decide the Case, 'tis plain Water-Baptism has not any such Effects ; the Apostle denies it to be *saving*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. and the Instance of *Simon Magus* is strong against it ; *he believed and was baptized*, and yet
was

was in the *Gall of Bitterness and Bond of Iniquity*, Acts viii. 23. And we have Reason sufficient to convince us, that Water-Baptism is no more effectual now than it was then.—Daily Experience confirms it. How many Thousands are there now adays, that have the Application of Baptismal Water, and yet their Souls are no more cleansed thereby than *Simon's* was? He says, *Nor is it against Reason*.—But let me tell him, 'tis repugnant to both Sense and Reason, that a little Elementary Water applied to an Infant's Face, or Forehead, should cleanse his Soul from Sin when he arrives at Maturity; or have either a concomitant, or subsequent, Effect respecting a spiritual Purgation.—The *Papists* themselves seem conscious of the Insufficiency of Elementary Water's cleansing the Soul, and expelling the Power of the Devil, by their several Additaments, as *Salt, Spittle, Oyl, Exorcism, &c.* which they use with Baptism. And we may suppose the *English Clergy* continue the *Sign of the Cross* as an Auxiliary to the Force of Water.

* *Protestants* oppose the *Papist's* Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, by Arguments drawn from Sense, Reason, and Revelation or Scripture; and so do we our Opponent's Doctrine of Water-Baptism; we think 'tis as clear from Sense, Reason

Reason and Scripture, that what he holds concerning Water-Baptism is not true, as what the *Papists* maintain about the *Bread* and *Wine* after the Priest's Consecration thereof.

In a Word, if we may be tolerated to judge of Causes by their Effects, (which certainly is a very rational Way of Determining) 'tis easie to conceive what Estimation should be put upon Water-Baptism; the Multitudes of uncleansed Souls, who have pass'd through that Administration, are most irrefutable Evidences of its being an Application of no Value. And how consistent it is with the Evangelical

Can we judge it suitable to the Divine Wisdom, to send into the World a Spirit superior to all created Beings, on purpose to teach Mankind such kind of Rites or Offices, as have not in themselves any natural Tendency either to enlighten our Understandings, or to enlarge or exalt our Powers and Capacities? The Apostle, as appears by the several Passages before cited out of this Epistle, had his Eye upon the Controversy then on foot about the Ritual Precepts, and positive Injunctions in the Law of Moses, for which the Christians educated that Way did so zealously contend. And how is it that he argues against those Persons? Doth he tell them, that we have no farther Need of those ancient carnal Institutions, by affirming that we have more, or better of our Lord's Appointment?

And

* Tit. ii. 11, 12. chap. i. ver. 1, 9, 13, 15. chap. ii. ver. 13, 14, 15 chap. iii. ver. 8, 9.

cal Dispensation, to suppose that Christ commanded a Duty, and the Service thereof never APPEAR, I leave to the Judicious to determine.

Our

“ And what must the Jewish Zealots, who maintain'd the Necessity of such Observations, have thought of our Apostle's Reasoning, if he should attempt to substitute, in their Room, the Observation of some other Rites of no more intrinsic Virtue than those which he required should be laid aside ?

“ Would not they reply upon him, that it was no more possible in the Nature of Things, for the River Streams, or the Fountain Waters, than for the Blood of Bulls and Goats to take away Sins ; and that they could not possibly conceive how the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, should have more Holiness and Virtue in them, than there might be found in their Paschal Lamb with the Unleaven'd Bread and bitter Herbs ?

“ All this the Apostle easily foresaw might well have been retorted, had he gone about to set up one Religious Rite in Opposition to another.

“ But instead of pleading for the Abolition of those ancient Institutions, in a Method so very liable to Exception, he assures them, that God had higher nobler Views in sending Christ into the World, and the main Intention of his Mission was, to bring Men back to a strict Regard of all natural and moral Duties.

“ This is visibly the Design of Christianity, as will appear to any one who shall impartially consult the sacred Writers of the New Testament.” Dr. Mitchell's Sermon (intituled *the Design of publishing the Gospel*) preach'd at Derby, Sept. 20. 1730. p. 11, 12, 13.

Our Author *P. B.* in his *Appendix* pag. 59. exhibics a publick Challenge, saying, “Before I dismiss this Subject, I must CHALLENGE ALL Maintainers of *Barclay’s* Arguments against Water-Baptism, wheresoe-ver, to give ME an Answer in plain and direct Words, to the three following Questions.

“*Quest. 1. Christ said to Nicodemus, Except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. John iii. 5. Here are two Instruments of this New Birth expressly particularized, Water, and the Spirit. I agree with them as to the Notion of the Spirit, but require them to tell me without any Equivocation, what is meant by the Word Water?*

“*Quest. 2. Christ commanded his Disciples to go teach all Nations, baptizing them, Mat. xxviii. Luke has given us an Account what they did in consequence of that Command. He tells how they went from Place to Place, teaching and making Converts, and baptizing those Converts with Water; but never once says, they baptized any one Person with the Holy Ghost. Is it possible to conceive he should take such frequent Notice of a Baptism they were not commanded to use, and never once say, that the Apostles baptized any one in the Way they were commanded? Which certainly he would*

M

“ have

" have done, if Christ had commanded them
 " to baptize with the Holy Ghost, because
 " his Design was to shew how they fulfilled
 " their Lord's Command; therefore I require
 " them to shew me any Place recorded in
 " Scripture, where the Apostles baptized any
 " Person with the Holy Ghost?

" *Quest. 3.* The Commission in St. Mat-
 " *thew*, chap. xxviii. is to baptize all Nations.
 " Here is a Matter of Fact commanded to
 " be done. If *Baptizing* here is to be under-
 " stood with the Spirit, and I should come
 " and desire such a Baptism, can any of the
 " Brethren of the Society of the Quakers give
 " me such a Baptism of the Spirit as shall qua-
 " lify me with the Extraordinary Gifts, such
 " as doing Miracles, healing the Sick, raising
 " the Dead, &c. Or can they give me the Spi-
 " rit in the Ordinary Way, in such a distin-
 " guishing Manner, that I shall know it from
 " my own Thoughts?

Reply to the first Quest. By the Word *Water*,
 is meant the cleansing Efficacy of the Spirit. The
 Term *Water* is used Exegetically, as *Fire* is in
 Mat. iii. 11. *Holy Ghost* and *Fire*, is as much
 as to say *Fiery Holy Ghost*; so here (i. e. *John*
 iii. 5.) *Water* and *Spirit*, is as much as to say
Watery Spirit, says the Learned *Grotius*.

" All being of a corrupt Birth, there is a
 " Necessity of a New Birth, and that by the
 " Spirit

" Spirit, (says Dr. Blake) there being no more
" Births (says he) than that of the *Flesh*, which
" is corrupt, and that of the *Spirit*, that
" comes to heal Corruption." See the *Re-*
ply to the *first Proposition*, where that Text
is fully treated of.

To the second Quest. To say the Apostles
went from Place to Place, teaching and bap-
tizing the Converts they made, with Water,
imports as much as if they made Water-Bap-
tism their constant Practice, that is, baptized
therewith all they converted; which we deny,
and challenge our Author, or any of his Ad-
herents or Assistants to prove. After all his
Search and utmost Investigation into the *Acts*
of the Apostles, he has produc'd but * eight
Places, (which he sets forth in as flourishing
a Manner as possible, in Order to make a
Shew) And the 1st, viz. that at *Jerusalem* is
doubtful, tho' it may be allowed, *Argumentandi*
Gratiâ, to speak of Water-Baptism, yet will it
fairly enough admit of Dispute. His 4th Place;
viz. near *Damascus*, relating to *Paul*, is not al-
lowed to mean Water-Baptism. His 8th and
last Place, viz. at *Ephesus* *Acts xix.* is denied
and disproved by several Learned *Theologists* of
the *Church of England*, as Dr. *Willet*, Dr. *Fulk*,
Dr. ¶ *Taylor*; so that our Author's asserting
M 2 *Paul*

* See his *Reply* to *E. P.* p. 13.

¶ On *Peter's* Sermon before *Cornelius*, p. 303.

Paul to have baptized those *Ephesian Brethren* with Water, militates as much against the *Doctors* of his own Church as the *Quakers*. The famous *Reformer J. Calvin* argues nervously on our Side, so does *Vatablus*, &c. as has been shewn; therefore two, if not three, of the eight Places he brings, are rejected; so there are but five of 'em that pass current, and at one of the five, the Number of the Baptized exceeds not a single Unit, and that was the *Ethiopian Eunuch*. And at two of the other Places, the Numbers, in all Probability, were but small. However, to counterbalance all these (supposing the Number of Places to be six) * I have produc'd other fix, to which may be added a seventh, from *Acts* iv. 4. where our ¶ Author himself says, *St. Peter at one Time converted above five Thousand*; and though Mention is made of such Multitudes being converted, yet there is not the least Hint of any one of 'em being baptized with Water, or any Thing like it: Nor are we at all oblig'd to believe they were, without a Relation of Fact, since such a Case undeniably falls under the Maxim, *Quod non lego non credo*, for we are very certain there is no such Text to be found in all the New Testament, as either explicitly or implicitly proves, that every Convert, every Christian, or true Believer, was either baptized, or required to be

* In Reply to the 3d Prop. ¶ Reply p. 25.

be baptized, with Water, in the Time of the Apostles. But though we are sure that none of our Opponents can shew us any such Text touching Water-Baptism, yet we can readily produce a Text that expressly proves that every true Believer was baptized with the *Spirit*. *Paul*, that chosen Vessel, and eminent Apostle to the *Gentiles*, though he signified that Christ *sent him not to baptize [with Water] but to preach the Gospel*; yet in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, chap. xii. ver. 13. he says, in so many express Words, **BY ONE SPIRIT ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY, whether (we be) Jews or Gentiles, whether (we be) Bond or Free.** * And Bishop *Taylor* expounds the Words of *John*, *Mat.* iii. 11. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, &c.* to mean, *that Christ shall baptize all that come to him with Fire and the Holy Ghost.* Also *Chrysostom* Bishop of *Constantinople*, on *Mat.* iii. *Homil.* 11. maintains, *that Christ baptizes ALL that WILLINGLY receive him, with the Holy Ghost.* Thus, I say, it is undeniably evident, that every true Believer, in the Days of the Apostles, was baptized with the Holy Ghost, initiated into the Church, or mystical Body of Christ, by the

M 3 Spiritual

* Could our Antagonists produce such a plain Text to evince the general Administration of Water-Baptism, we own they might upon good Authority assert, that the Apostles baptized all the Converts they made, with Water; but without it, such groundless Insinuations merit no other Notice than a flat Denial.

Spiritual Baptism. And that the Apostles did baptize therewith, has, I think, been fully prov'd; yet to speak directly to the other Part of his Question, viz. to shew a Place recorded in Scripture, where the Apostles baptized any Person with the Holy Ghost; I shall briefly touch upon one Instance, and first observe the Commission in *Mat. xxviii.* is to teach, baptizing, Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. And *Mark chap. xvi. ver. 15.* delivering the same Commission, mentions not *Baptizing*, but *Preaching the Gospel*; which shews the Baptism there commanded, was not an Exercise distinct from Teaching or Preaching, but the proper Effect thereof, included therein.

And that the Apostles did so teach, (*i. e. Teach baptizing*) is apparent from what the Evangelist *Luke* relates touching *Cornelius* and his fellow Converts, *Acts x. 44.* For in the very Instant the Apostle taught them, *they were all baptized with the Holy Ghost.* *Acts xi. 15, 16.*

2dly, That the Apostle was the instrumental Means of their being so baptized, is undeniable from *Acts xi. 14, 15.*

Thus then 'tis clear and evident, by what *Luke* has delivered or left upon Record, that the Apostle *Peter* did baptize with the Holy Ghost, in Consequence, and by Virtue of that Commission, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* He acted pursuant

suant to the very Letter of the Text; for he Taught Baptizing them.

The Commission directs to *teach baptizing*, and the Historian *Luke* tells us in Effect, that these *Gentiles* were baptized with the *Holy Ghost* under the Apostle's Ministry, or while he taught them: What can be plainer?

And it is likewise fairly deducible from what *Luke* reports, that not only *Peter*, but also *John*, *Ananias* and *Paul*, baptized with the Holy Ghost. See the preceding Pages in Reply to the Third Proposition.

To the third Quest. To confer or dispense, what he calls the Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, as *raising the Dead*, &c. we do not pretend; yet that God may enable his Ministers to effect such Miracles, we deny not: But as to what he calls the Ordinary Gifts or Communication of the Spirit, which in his *Letter*, p. 12. he defines, "to be that which illuminates our Understandings, in our sincere and diligent Enquiries after Divine Truth; that which excites our Wills to that which is good, and strengthens our vigorous Endeavours in the Prosecution of it." To this I answer in the Affirmative, (as having often experienc'd the Truth hereof) that many of the Brethren of the Society of the People call'd *Quakers* have, through the Assistance of Christ, in whom their Sufficiency is, con-

ferred such Gifts, or Measures of the Spirit to the Well-disposed and sincere Auditors.

And this Doctrine is not inconsistent, but agreeable to what several Doctors of the *Church of England* have taught. Dr. *Hammond* holds, “ That Christ’s Ministers were impowered to “ communicate spiritual Gifts.” See his *Paraphrase and Annotations on Acts* i. 5.—ii. 38. —viii. 17. *Rom.* i. 11, 12. Dr. *Burkitt* on *Acts* ix. 17. asserts, “ That *Ananias*, tho’ “ but an ordinary and private Christian, yet “ had Power to confer the Holy Ghost.” And on *John* vii. 38. says, “ Christ and his “ Spirit are a living Fountain, whose Waters “ never fail; they are not a Water-Brook, “ but a Spring of Waters; we shall never “ miss of the Waters of Life, if we seek unto “ and wait upon Christ for them: For if we “ believe on him, *out of our Belly shall flow Ri- “ vers of living Waters*, sufficient for our “ selves, and wherewith to refresh others.”

Upon which observe, that by the Pronoun [We] in the last Period, he means the Ministers; and by *Rivers of living Waters*, the sanctifying and saving Graces of the Holy Spirit. So that to say, *out of our Belly shall flow Rivers of living Waters, wherewith to refresh others*, is equivalent to saying, *that the sanctifying and saving Graces of the Holy Spirit, shall flow from, or be conveyed by, the Ministers to the Hearers, sufficient for their Necessity.* The which

which (in my Thoughts) is in Effect to say,
The Ministers shall baptize with the Spirit.

Our Author tells us pag. 20. that "The
" Washing of Water upon the Outward, is
" the Means of conveying the Sanctification
" of the Spirit in the Inward Man; which
" effects a New and Spiritual Birth upon all
" those, who being duly disposed, receive
" the Rite." But is it not much more rational, and in all Respects more consistent, that a Minister of Christ, under the Immediate Influence of the Holy Spirit, should be a Means of conveying the Sanctification thereof in the Inward Man, (which effects a new and spiritual Birth upon those who being duly disposed, receive his Doctrine) than an inanimate and corruptible Element?

To be short, I am persuaded, that the intelligent and unbiassed will, upon due Consideration, find, that we are herein more orthodox, more consonant, both to sacred Scripture, the common Principles of *Evangelical Theology*, and natural Reason, than our *Opponent.
And

*Methinks our Author and his Fraternity should, above all Men, be very cautious of broaching or suggesting any such Doctrine, as if the Ministers could not confer of the Spirit even in an ordinary Way, since the Clergy so liberally participate of the People's Temporals, on Pretence of administering Spirituals, and effecting the Cure of Souls.

And now I freely leave it to thy impartial Judgment, *candid Reader*, whether what has been offer'd, doth not sufficiently manifest the Invalidity, Weakness, and Inconsistence of what this *Norfolk* Author has advanc'd to prove his grand Assertion, *viz.*
 " That Water-Baptism is the Ordinance our
 " Saviour has appointed for one of the Means
 " of Salvation; without which, according
 " to the Terms of the Gospel, we cannot en-
 " ter into the Kingdom of Heaven." p. 4.

And as a short Recapitulation of the whole, I recommend to thy Observation these subsequent Particulars.

1. That he, by asserting the *Abolition* of John's *Baptism*, laid himself under a Necessity of producing a positive Command for the Practice of Water-Baptism, distinct from that of *John's*, which notwithstanding he has not been able to produce.
2. That Water-Baptism cannot be proved to be an Ordinance of the Gospel from any Command, or Practice of Christ, either before or after his Resurrection.
3. That not any Scripture-Text can be shewn, that either explicitly or implicitly proves, that every Convert was either baptized, or required to be baptized, with Water in the Apostles Days.

4. That

4. That what the Apostles practised thereof, (which cannot be proved to have been in a general Way, but only upon some Particulars) is not at all obligatory; nay no more than their using Circumcision and other *Jewish Rites*. 1st, Because it cannot be proved, that when they did baptize any with Water, that they perform'd it in Obedience to any Command of Christ; for that would be directly to maintain that Christ had instituted two Baptisms, contrary to *Eph. iv. 5*. Since every Christian, according to *1 Cor. xii. 13*. was baptized with the Spirit. And the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, have cautiously guarded against such a Notion or Supposal: The first, by denying it to be that which *saves*.* And the other by testifying, that it was not in his *Commission*. ¶ Secondly, The Baptism which they used, was no other than *John's*, the which our Author affirms is *abolished*.

5. That Water-Baptism is not in the least obligatory by Tradition, or what he calls the Practice of the Catholick-Church; since Scripture Examples themselves (much more Traditional ones) have, according to Bishop *Stillingsfleet's Postulatum*, not any obligatory Force to bind all perpetually, unless

* *1 Pet. iii. 21*.

¶ *1 Cor. i. 17*.

less the same proceeded from the moral Nature of the Action, or some positive Law of God; but 'tis well known, none of 'em all can produce either of these for the Continuance of Water-Baptism.

6. That the Practice of *Infant-Baptism* and *Sprinkling*, is even according to our Author's own Confession, but a mere human Invention, introduced since the first Ages of Christianity. So that should we enter upon a narrow Scrutiny into Primitive Practice respecting Water-Baptism, and exactly compare it with what is used by our Opponent's Society, 'tis a great Question, whether they would be found to be any more baptized, properly speaking, than the *Quakers*.*

7. That the Baptism commanded *Mat. xxviii. 19.* was not Water-Baptism, but the Baptism of the Spirit, is clearly proved. 1st, From the Declaration of *John the Baptist*. 2dly, From our Author's own Arguments, as well upon *John iii. 5.* (being taken in Conjunction with the Expositions of divers Learned and approved Writers thereon) as upon *Mark xvi. 16.* (taken conjunctly with the

* " That the Baptism of Infants so called, perform'd
" by Sprinkling, is indeed no Baptism. *Davey on Baptism*, p. 47.

the Apostle's Doctrine contained in *Eph. i. 13, 14.*—iv. 30.) 3dly, From *Eph. v. 26. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Tit. iii. 5. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 12. Rom. vi. 3, 4.* In all which Places 'tis very plain the Apostle has Relation to the Inward or Spiritual Baptism.*

To draw to a Conclusion, Since that according to the Apostle's Doctrine, there is but *One Baptism* to continue in the Christian Church, which *One Baptism* is undoubtedly the Baptism of Christ, which according to what is declared in the four Evangelists, viz. *Mat. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16, 17. John i. 33.* is that of *the Spirit*; and seeing that by

our

“ *Jesus Christ as a second *Adam* doth beget Children
 “ after his own Image—The first *Adam* brought forth
 “ Children in his own Likeness, deriving to them the
 “ same Spirit which was in himself. So doth the second
 “ *Adam* propagate his Posterity, and give unto 'em his
 “ own Spirit, which is supernatural and Heavenly—
 “ The Lord Jesus Christ finds the Children of the first
 “ *Adam* in their natural Capacity, and makes 'em the
 “ Subjects of his Grace, but he bringeth forth upon
 “ their Minds and Spirits a new Creation—He begets
 “ Children unto himself as a Father, and unites Mem-
 “ bers unto himself as an Head; he transplanteth Souls
 “ into another Soil, and they live in him, deriving Sap-
 “ and Spirit from him, as from their Soil, their new
 “ Root. The Apostle *Gal. iv.* doth thus express it,
 “ *My little Children with whom I travel in Birth, expect*
 “ *ἐμποιῶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν* until Christ be formed in you,
 “ that is, until the Spirit of our Lord Jesus comes to be
 “ that

our Opponent's own Confession, *The Baptism of the Spirit is implied in the One Baptism:*
Yea,

“ that unto your Souls, which your Souls are to your
 “ Bodies: The reasonable Soul in Man, is the Principle
 “ of Life, and that by which he is denominated to be a
 “ Man, and distinguished from a Beast; so doth the
 “ Spirit of Christ, working it self into the Soul of Man,
 “ transforming him into his own Image, and this new
 “ Creature hath the same Spirit, Nature and Disposi-
 “ tion with Jesus Christ, whereby he is denominated a
 “ Christian.—The Spirit and Life of Christ communi-
 “ cated to his People, doth make them capable and a-
 “ ble to understand his Will.—The Old and New Te-
 “ stament is full of Promises of the Spirit, *All thy People*
 “ *shall be Obedient to the taught of God; a new Heart will*
 “ *I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you; I*
 “ *will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in*
 “ *my Statutes; I will make a new Covenant with the House*
 “ *of Israel, I will put my Laws in their Minds, and write*
 “ *them upon their Hearts, and they shall not teach every*
 “ *Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, saying,*
 “ *know the Lord, as if they were ignorant of him, or*
 “ *unacquainted with him; for they shall all know me from*
 “ *the least to the greatest. And this Spirit which I will pour*
 “ *out upon my Servants and mine Handmaids, shall lead them*
 “ *into all Truth*—When the Soul is born again of that in-
 “ corruptible Seed, and transplanted into our Lord Je-
 “ sus as into a new Root, partaking of his Sap and Spi-
 “ rit, then doth it attain to a more clear Understand-
 “ ing of the Will of God, and hath a more perfect Sa-
 “ vour and Relish of Christ and his Ways. This Holy
 “ Spirit is that true *Shechenah*, that Indwelling of God
 “ in the Soul, which was anciently shadowed out by
 “ that cloudy Presence, which sat between the Cheru-
 “ bims Wings in Solomon's Temple.” Dr. Ames, his
 Sermon intituled, *The holy Anointing the best Teacher.* p.
 15, 16, 17, —26, 27.

Yea, since the Spiritual Baptism is that wherewith Christ daily baptizeth all that willingly receive him, says Chrysostom: That which baptizes our Spirits, says an Ancient and Learned Author: That which regenerates and renews the Hearts of the Elect, says Pifcator: That which cleanses the Faithful from Sin, saith a Lapide: That which washes the Soul as Water doth the Body, says Calvin: That which purges our Consciences, says the Learned Peters: That which kindles Zeal in our Hearts, says Dr. Willet: That which is necessary to Salvation, says Dr. Fulk: That which purges our Lusts and Corruptions, says Pool: That which consumes the Dross, saith Henry: Makes Partakers of the Adoption of the Sons of God, says the famous Stephens: The only necessary Baptism, according to Walter Brute: That wherewith Christ baptizes all that come unto him, saith Bishop Taylor: What the Common-Prayer-Book directs to pray for: That which only saves, says Dr. Burkitt: And without which none can be saved, according to the Assembly of Divines: That whereby we are all ingrafted into, or made Members of the mystical Body of Christ, agreeable to the Apostle 1 Cor. xii. 13: How greatly then doth it concern us every one, even the whole Christian World, earnestly to press after the experimental Enjoyment thereof, laying aside all Shadows and Resemblances; especially, since we have such

'a Cloud of Witnesses on our Side? Though
 many may strenuously plead for the Necessity
 of Elementary Baptism, yet when they come
 to the Test, or close to the Point, they are
 forced, ultimately, to yield, that 'tis the Spi-
 ritual Baptism that effects our Spiritual Pur-
 gation, produces the New Birth, &c. " 'Tis
 " the Holy Ghost (says Archbishop *Williams*)
 " who sanctifies me and all the elect People of
 " God.—His Operations (*says he*) are very
 " many, and can hardly be particularly enu-
 " merated. He (*i. e.* the Holy Ghost) not
 " only regenerates, and sanctifies us; disposes
 " us to our Duty; and fortifies us against
 " Temptation; but moreover directs us in
 " our Doubts, comforts us in our Afflictions,
 " supports us in our Troubles, arms us a-
 " gainst the Fear of Death, gives us Strength
 " and Courage in Trials and Persecutions:
 " And in such Cases as he sees needful, seals
 " our Souls with such an inward Sense and
 " Assurance of God's Favour, as makes us
 " firmly satisfied of our future Everlasting
 " Salvation."*

* The Principles of the Christian Religion explained,
 p. 63.

P O S T S C R I P T.

FORASMUCH as our Author asserts, p. 34, 35. "That Christ has constituted a Church, and appointed Water-Baptism as the initiating Sign and Seal, whereby Men are to be made Members thereof, and incorporated thereinto; and that until we have thus in a publick Manner entred ourselves into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, and by Water-Baptism be admitted into his Church, we can plead no Claim to the Promises of the Gospel, nor even call our selves Christians, or have any Right or Title to that Name."

I require him, or any of his Accomplices, to tell us plainly, who or what this Church or Congregation, he speaks of, is, or under what Name or Denomination it goes. Whether 'tis the *Church of Rome*, the *Church of England*, so called, the *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, or *Anabaptist*; for every of these use Water-Baptism?

If he should answer, that 'tis the *Church of England*, or the *English Episcopalian*, he intends, (as very probably he does, being one of her Sons himself) I may tell him plainly,

N

that

that we deny that what she uses is Baptism, or has any Right to be so denominated. As for *Infants sprinkling*, that is clearly exploded, not only by what himself has said in his *Appendix* p. 50. but also by the concurring Testimonies of divers Learned Authors, as is before shewn: And hear farther what another of them says, "He that swerves from the Institution as SPRINKLERS do, doth sin against Christ's Command, whatever any Divines, or Assembly of Men say to the contrary."

"He that affirms that Baptizing without Dipping is not lawful, that it is Will-worship, that it is a Nullity; that notwithstanding such pretended Baptisms, yet Baptism remains a Duty, speaks but the Truth: —I may truly say, (*saiſt he*) that Pedobaptism hath been as CURSED a ROOT of corrupting the Churches, &c. as I think (except some few) any other Corruption in the Christian Religion."

2. I desire to know, with what Face our Author could † pretend, "That he has fairly drawn forth, examined and refuted all *R. Barclay's* Arguments," when 'tis apparent

* *J. Tomber* his Plea for the Antipedobaptists, part 3. Sect. 5, and 6.

† In his Title-Page of his Reply to *Edmund Peckover*, see also p. 50. *Ibid.* where he says he thinks he has answered every material Argument brought by *R. Barclay*.

rent, that he has not only pass'd by many, nay most of his Arguments relating to Baptism in general, without Examination, but hath not taken the least Notice of *Infants sprinkling* in order to defend the Practice of his own Church, though *R. Barclay* in his very *Thesis* exprelly says, *That it is a meer human Tradition, for which neither Precept nor Practice is to be found in all the Scriptures.*

Therefore I say, with what Modesty or Moderation could our Author pretend his Performances to be *An Examination, &c. of the Standard of the Quaker's Faith respecting Baptism*, when he has wholly passed by such a considerable Part thereof as *Infant-sprinkling*? This is such a material and principal Part of the Question betwixt him and us, that if he cannot prove it to be a Gospel Institution, inasmuch as the same is the common Practice of the Church he belongs to, he comes miserably short. And in my Opinion, he has not at all acted rationally, in troubling the World with his *Pamphlets*, and addressing himself to us, without fairly clearing and establishing that Point. As to what he says, *Appendix p. 59. That he is writing to the Adult*, 'tis but an Evasion, and a very barefac'd one too; for suppose any of us should be convinced by his weighty Arguments, that Water-Baptism is necessary, what will become of his Children, supposing he has any? Is it not requisite and necessary, that they should have the Advan-

tage of Baptism as well as the *Adult*? Hear what our Author's Elder Brother *D. Ruffen*, says of them that deny *Infant-Baptism*, viz.

“ That they do as much as in 'em lies, to separate them from Christ, and as it were,
 “ pluck 'em out of his Arms; offering 'em
 “ greater Injury than to dash 'em against the
 “ Stones: 'tis to deny them *Church Communion*,
 “ and to deprive People of all sound Hopes of
 “ their Salvation; for without Church Communion, where it can be had, *he says*, he
 “ knows no Salvation.—That it is hard to lay
 “ what Account the *Antipedobaptists* can give
 “ to God at the last Tribunal for their execrable Injury to their own Children: And
 “ that he believes, the *Jewish Woman*, who
 “ in the Wars of *Jerusalem* killed her Child
 “ and eat it, will be more excusable, because
 “ (*says he*) she only killed the Body, and that
 “ for Food in a Time of extream Famine;
 “ but these kill the Soul in a Time of Plenty,
 “ when all our Church Doors stand open, and
 “ the *Font* next the Door to admit Infants into
 “ the Church's Communion.” *

How much then should it have concerned our *Norfolk* Author, to have produc'd his
 ¶ Pleas he talks of, in order to have fully established

* His Book intituled *Fundamentals*, &c. chap. iii. which Book was sent forth under the Protection of two Clergymen, viz. Dr. Peck, and Dr. Broom.

established that Point, if the Omission or Neglect thereof, is attended with such dreadful Consequences?

3. He says p. 20. "That the washing of Water upon the Outward, gives us a Title, and is the Means of conveying the Sanctification of the Spirit in the inward Man."

Upon which I query,

First, How or by what Means doth he suppose, that the Water being applied to the Body, conveys the Sanctification of the Spirit to the Soul or inward Man? Doth he hold that the Grace of the Spirit is contained in the Water, or that the Water receives it, as some of the * Ancients did?

Secondly, By what Token or Evidence doth he, or any of his Persuasion, or Adherents, certainly know, that the Baptismal-Water, being applied to an Infant, doth convey the Sanctification of the Spirit? Doth he hold according to what his elder Brother *Russen* says, "¶ That Baptism imprints an INDELIBLE Character of Christianity upon the Person, which neither *Schism*, *Heresy*, nor *Apostacy*" it

* *August. Homil. 35. in 5 cap. Joan. Ambro. de Sacram. lib. 4. cap. 4, 9. Tertullian de Baptismo.*

¶ *Fundamentals, Preface. See also Stenner's Answer, p. 11.*

"it self can blot out?" If he does, let him likewise inform us, what this Indelible Character is, and how we may distinguish the Person by it.

4. Whether doth he allow the Baptism administered by or among those called *Antiepiscopeal Dissenters*, as *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Anabaptists*, to be Christian, or authorized Baptism? Or whether 'tis his Opinion, that none hath right Authority to administer Baptism, but such as are *Episcopally* commission'd?

The * Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, part 2, *Preface* p. 5, 10. holds, "That for Persons to baptize, who never were *Episcopally* commission'd, is an Usurpation of a MONSTROUS NATURE. *Ibid.* p. 258. Signifies that *Dissenter's* Baptisms are null and void by the *Articles*, *Canons*, and *Rubricks* of the *Church of England*." And p. 270, 271. He not only calls the Baptizers among the Dissenters, Uncommission'd Usurpers, but accounts it much safer and less sinful, to die unbaptized, than to submit to their Baptism.

5. Whether he will admit, that the One Baptism which the Apostle mentions *Eph. iv.*

5.

* Who appears to have been a Priest of the Church of England.

5. and which he asserts (*Appendix* p. 38.) consists of two Parts, the *Water* and the *Spirit*, was entirely the same Baptism which Christ commanded his Apostles to baptize with *Mat.* xxviii. 19? If he allows it to be entirely the same, it thence follows, that the Apostles baptized with the Spirit as well as with Water; for he * affirms *the Apostles baptized with that Baptism which Christ commanded*, *Mat.* 28. If he will not allow it to be entirely the same, then this Absurdity will be the consequence hereof, *viz.* That the Baptism which Christ commanded *Mat.* xxviii. was not the *One Baptism* which the Apostle taught *Eph.* iv. 5. And the same will also press hard upon, if not quite overturn his Notion of *Water* and *Spirit* making up but *One Baptism*.

6. In his Letter p. 13. he maintains, "That the Baptism with the Spirit or Holy Ghost, in Scripture always signifies *the being endued with his Extraordinary Gifts*, which is now wholly ceased." But in his *Appendix*, p. 39. he holds, "That the Baptism with the Spirit, signifies *washing the Soul, i. e.* freeing it from sinful Pollutions." Therefore, 'tis desired he would fairly reconcile these two Assertions, for they are obviously contradictory to each other.

The

* Letter p. 17.

184 *The Quaker's Answer to the &c.*

The 1st maintains the Baptism with the Spirit to be long ago ceased.

The 2d Holds it to be still continued as necessary to Salvation. Nay, I appeal to every judicious and impartial Reader, whether our Author by construing the Baptism with the Spirit, to be that Measure or Communication thereof which frees the Soul from sinful Pollutions, has not fully destroy'd his own Argument (advanc'd p. 12. and 13. of his *Letter*, to prove the Baptism commanded *Mat. xxviii.* to be Water-Baptism) and plainly confirm'd, our Doctrine of the Spirit's Baptism.

F I N I S.



Spi

Tary

ious

nor

to

eof

ons

ad

ove

be

our